

Detecting the c -effectivity of motives, their weights, connectivity, and dimension via Chow-weight (co)homology: a "mixed motivic decomposition of the diagonal"

Mikhail V. Bondarko, Vladimir A. Sosnilo *

August 15, 2016

Abstract

We describe certain criteria for a motif M to be c -effective, i.e., to belong to the c th Tate twist $\mathrm{Obj} DM_{\mathrm{gm},R}^{eff}(c) = \mathrm{Obj} DM_{\mathrm{gm},R}^{eff} \otimes \mathbb{L}^{\otimes c}$ of effective Voevodsky motives (for $c \geq 1$; R is the coefficient ring). In particular, M is 1-effective if and only if a complex whose terms are certain Chow groups of zero-cycles is acyclic. The dual to this statement checks whether an effective motif M belongs to the subcategory of $DM_{\mathrm{gm},R}^{eff}$ generated by motives of varieties of dimension $\leq c$.

These criteria are formulated in terms of the *Chow-weight* (co)homology of M . These homology theories are introduced in the current paper and have several (other) remarkable properties: they yield a bound on the weights of M (in the sense of the Chow weight structure defined by the first author) and detect the effectivity of "the lower weight pieces" of M . We also calculate the connectivity of M (in the sense of Voevodsky's homotopy t -structure, i.e., we study motivic homology) and prove that the exponents of the higher motivic homology groups (of an "integral" motif) are finite whenever these groups are torsion. These motivic properties of M have important consequences for its (co)homology.

Our results yield vast generalizations of the so-called "decomposition of the diagonal" statements.

Contents

1	Some preliminaries on weight structures	5
1.1	Some (categorical) notation and lemmas	6
1.2	Weight structures: basics	7
1.3	Weight structures in localizations	10
1.4	On weight complexes and weight spectral sequences	11

*The main results of the paper were obtained under support of the Russian Science Foundation grant no. 16-11-10200.

2	On motives, their weights, and various (complexes of) Chow groups	13
2.1	Some notation and basics on Voevodsky motives	14
2.2	Chow weight structures for motivic categories and their applications	15
2.3	On higher Chow groups and motivic homology over various fields	19
3	The central results	23
3.1	Chow-weight homology: definition and basic properties	23
3.2	Relating Chow-weight homology to c -effectivity and weights of motives	25
3.3	A generalization (in terms of staircase sets)	27
3.4	Criteria in terms of higher Chow-weight homology; an application to motivic homology	30
4	Supplements and applications	32
4.1	On the detection of c -effectivity and weights by (singular) homology and cohomology	32
4.2	Chow-weight cohomology and the dimension of motives	35
4.3	Comparing integral and rational coefficients: bounding torsion of homology	37
4.4	On motives with "small" Chow-weight homology and cycle classes	41
4.5	Some more remarks; possible development	43

Introduction

The well-known technique of *decomposition of the diagonal* (cf. Remark 0.2 below) was introduced by Bloch and Srinivas in [BS83] (whereas a rich collection of recent results related to this notion can be found in [Voi14]). Let us recall some easily formulated "motivic" results obtained via this method (and essentially established in [Via11]). For simplicity, we will state them for motives and Chow groups with rational coefficients over a universal domain k (though certain generalizations of these results are also available).

Proposition 0.1. (i) Let M be an effective Chow motif over k . Then M is c -effective (i.e., it can be presented as $M' \otimes \mathbb{L}^{\otimes c}$ for some $c > 0$ and an effective M') if and only if $\text{Chow}_j(M) = 0$ for $0 \leq j < c$ (see Remark 3.10 of [Via11]).

(ii) Let $h : N \rightarrow M$ be a morphism of effective Chow motives. Then $\text{Chow}_0(h)$ is surjective if and only if it "splits modulo 1-effective motives", i.e., if it corresponds to a representation of M as a retract of $N \oplus Q \otimes \mathbb{L}$ for some effective motives N and Q (this is essentially Theorem 3.6 of *ibid.*; cf. Remark 0.2 below).

(iii) Let $h : N \rightarrow M$ be a morphism of effective Chow motives. Then the homomorphisms $\text{Chow}_j(h)$ are surjective for all $j \geq 0$ if and only if h splits (this is Theorem 3.18 of *ibid.*).

Certainly, the Poincaré duals to these results are also valid (cf. Remark 3.11 of *ibid.*). In statements of this sort one usually takes M being the motif of a smooth projective P/k , whereas N is obtained by resolving singularities of a closed subvariety P' of P (cf. Lemma 3 of [GoG13] and Theorem 3.6 of [Via11]). In this case, if $\text{Chow}_j(h)$ is surjective for all $j < c$ then the diagonal cycle Δ in

$P \times P$ (given by the diagonal embedding $P \rightarrow P \times P$) is rationally equivalent to the sum of a cycle supported on $P' \times P$ and a one supported on $P \times W$ for some closed $W \subset P$ of codimension $\geq c$ (see Proposition 6.1 of [Par94]).

Remark 0.2. The latter formulation is an example of the decomposition of the diagonal statements in their "ordinary" form.

One can usually reformulate these cycle-theoretic statements using the following trivial observation: if M is an object of an additive category B , $id_M = f_1 + f_2$ (for $f_1, f_2 \in B(M, M)$), and f_i factor through some objects M_i of B (for $i = 1, 2$), then M is a retract of $M_1 \oplus M_2$. In particular, if B is Karoubian (see §1.1 below; this is the case for all "motivic" categories), then M is a direct summand of $M_1 \oplus M_2$.

One of the motivations for the results of this sort is that they reduce the study of various properties of M to the study of "more simple motives" (i.e., of motives of varieties of smaller dimensions); cf. Theorem 1 of [BIS83] and §3.1.2 of [Voi14]. Certainly, these statements have nice (and natural) cohomological consequences; cf. Proposition 6.4 of [Par94].

The goal of the current paper is to generalize (in various forms) the aforementioned decomposition of the diagonal statements to objects of the R -linear Voevodsky's (effective geometric) motivic category $DM_{\text{gm}, R}^{\text{eff}}$; here R is an arbitrary coefficient ring that we (only) assume to contain $1/p$ if the characteristic of the base field k is $p > 0$. Recall that the category $\underline{Chow}_R^{\text{eff}}$ of (R -linear) effective Chow motives naturally embeds into $DM_{\text{gm}, R}^{\text{eff}}$, whereas the "most important" extensions of the functors $Chow_j^R$ to $DM_{\text{gm}, R}^{\text{eff}}$ are the *motivic homology* functors corepresented by $\mathbb{L}^{\otimes j}$ (for j being a non-negative integer). Yet one can easily check that these homology theories cannot be used to formulate the generalizations in question. So in the current paper we describe completely new *Chow-weight homology* theories whose properties are completely satisfactory for our purposes. These theories are closely related to motivic homology ones; still they are a little easier to compute.

Our main results include a criterion for an effective Voevodsky motif to be *c-effective* (i.e., to belong to $\text{Obj } DM_{\text{gm}, R}^{\text{eff}}(k) \otimes \mathbb{L}^{\otimes c}$). As a particular case we obtain the following: in the setting of Proposition 0.1(ii) the cone of h is *c-effective* (i.e., the two-term complex $N \rightarrow M$ is homotopy equivalent to a cone of a morphism of *c-effective* Chow motives) if and only if $Chow_j(h)$ is bijective for all $j < c$.¹ This is also equivalent to the existence of a morphism $h' : M \rightarrow N$ that is "inverse to h modulo cycles supported in codimension c " (see Remark 3.3.6 below for more detail). We also establish a criterion for $Chow_j^R(h)$ to be bijective for $j < c_1$ and surjective for $c_1 \leq j < c_2$ (in Corollary 3.3.5). Even these very particular cases of our results appear to be new; they demonstrate that we really generalize the decomposition of the diagonal statements. Certainly, all of these results have natural (co)homological consequences (see §4.1; for k being finite they are also related to the study of $\#X(k)$ modulo powers of $\#k$, where X is a k -variety).

Now we say a few words on Chow-weight homology theories. They are defined as the (co)homology of the complexes obtained by applying $Chow_j^R$

¹For general k and R one has to compute $Chow_*^R$ at arbitrary function fields over k in this criterion.

(for $j \geq 0$) to the *weight complex* of M (as defined in [Bon09] and [Bon10a]).² Chow-weight homology "detects effectivity" of motives and has several other remarkable properties; in particular, it bounds the weights of motives (i.e., $M \in DM_{\text{gm}, R}^{\text{eff}} w_{\text{Chow}} \leq -n$ in the notation of §2.2 below if and only if its Chow-weight homology vanishes in degrees $> n$; see Theorem 3.2.1(3)). It certainly follows that the higher degree Chow-weight homology of M can be "detected" through the E_2 -terms of (Chow-) weight spectral sequences for any (co)homology of M (these weight spectral sequences generalize Deligne's ones; see §4.1 below for more detail). Moreover, one can "mix" the effectivity criteria with the weight ones; in particular, this yields a criterion for M to be $c - 1$ -connective (i.e., to belong to $DM_{-R}^{\text{eff}} t_{\text{hom}}^R \leq -c$ for some $c \in \mathbb{Z}$; here t_{hom}^R is the R -linear version of the homotopy t -structure of Voevodsky that we recall in Remark 2.1.1 below). We also prove the following (using certain results of [Sos15]): if the higher degree Chow-weight homology (resp. motivic homology) groups of M are torsion then their exponents are finite; see Corollary 4.3.6.

Furthermore, we pass to the dual in Theorem 3.2.1 and obtain a bound on the *dimension* of M (see Proposition 4.2.1 below).

For the sake of the readers scared of Voevodsky motives, we note that our results can be applied to $K^b(\underline{\text{Chow}}_R^{\text{eff}})$ (i.e., to complexes of R -linear Chow motives) instead of $DM_{\text{gm}, R}^{\text{eff}}$; see Remark 3.3.4 below. Yet even these more elementary versions of our results are "quite triangulated", and their proofs involve certain (triangulated) categories of birational motives.³

Now let us describe the contents of the paper; some more information of this sort can be found at the beginnings of sections.

In §1 we recall a part of the theory of weight structures.

In §2 we describe several properties of (various categories of) Voevodsky motives and of Chow weight structures for them. The most important (though somewhat technical) results of this section are Proposition 2.2.6(2,5) on certain morphisms between Chow motives. We also prove some auxiliary statements on the behaviour of complexes whose terms are certain (higher) Chow groups under morphisms of base fields; most of these results are more or less well-known.

In §3 we define (our main) *Chow-weight* homology theories and study their properties. In particular we express the weights of a motif M (defined in terms of the Chow weight structure) and its effectivity (i.e., whether it belongs to $\text{Obj } DM_{\text{gm}, R}^{\text{eff}} \otimes \mathbb{L}^{\otimes c}$ for a given $c > 0$) in terms of its Chow-weight homology. We also relate the vanishing of the higher degree Chow-weight homology of M with that of its motivic homology (and so, with its homotopy t -structure connectivity).

In §4 we deduce several corollaries from the results of the previous section. We relate motivic conditions on M (that are equivalent to the corresponding vanishing of Chow-weight homology) to the (co)homology of M . The "direct" implication here is straightforward. Moreover, the combination of two (of more or less "standard") motivic conjectures yields the following result in the converse direction: the vanishing (resp. the c -effectivity) of the higher levels of the

²The relation of our weight complex functor to the one of Gillet and Soulé is recalled in Remark 1.4.3(2) below.

³We also note that the vanishing of Chow-weight homology of M in **negative** degrees does not yield the corresponding bound on the weights of M (in contrast to Theorem 3.2.1(3); see Remark 3.2.2(4). Hence our results (including their $K^b(\underline{\text{Chow}}_R^{\text{eff}})$ -versions) cannot be deduced from Proposition 0.1 (and from other statements of this sort).

(Deligne's) weight filtration on the singular homology of M is equivalent to the corresponding vanishing of the Chow-weight homology of M (see Proposition 4.1.3 for a more precise and general formulation). Note also that in the case where k is finite the effectivity conditions for motives are closely related to numbers of rational points of k -varieties (taken modulo powers of $q = \#k$); see Remark 4.1.2(3).

We also dualize some of our results; this allows us to calculate the dimensions of motives and bound their weights (from above) in terms of their *Chow-weight cohomology*. Next we prove that the vanishing of rational Chow-weight homology in a certain range for M is "almost equivalent" to M being an extension of a motif satisfying integral Chow-weight homology vanishing in the same range by a torsion motif (see Theorem 4.3.5). This implies the following: if the higher motivic homology groups of a motif M are torsion, then their exponents are finite. Moreover, we study the finite-dimensionality of Chow-weight homology and relate it to cycle classes for Chow-weight homology. We also make several remarks on possible development of our results (in §4.5).

For the convenience of the readers we list some of the terminology and notation used in this paper. Karoubian categories, Karoubi envelopes, extension-closed and Karoubi-closed subcategories, extension-closures, Karoubi-closures, $X \perp Y$, $D^\perp$, and ${}^\perp D$ are defined in §1.1; weight structures (general and bounded ones), their hearts, the classes $\underline{C}_{w \geq i}$, $\underline{C}_{w \leq i}$, $\underline{C}_{w=i}$, $\underline{C}_{[i,j]}$, weight-exact functors, negative subcategories of triangulated categories, and weight truncations $w_{\leq m}M$ and $w_{\geq m}M$ of M are recalled in §1.2; weight complexes, weight filtrations, and weight spectral sequences are recalled in §1.4; the motivic categories $\underline{Chow}_R^{eff} \subset DM_{gm,R}^{eff} \subset DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$ and $\underline{Chow}_R$, the functor M_{gm}^R , (shifted) Tate twists $\langle c \rangle = -(c)[2c]$, the categories $DM_{-R}^{eff} \subset DM_R^{eff}$ and the homotopy t -structure t_{hom}^R for it are introduced in §2.1; the Chow weight structures w_{Chow} on $DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$, on its twists $DM_{gm,R}^{eff}(n)$, and its subcategories $d_{\leq m}DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$, along with c -effectivity and dimensions for motives, and the functors $l^c : DM_{gm,R}^{eff} \rightarrow DM_{gm}^R$ are introduced in §2.2; essentially finitely generated extensions of fields, universal domains, fields of definition for motives, rational extensions, function fields and their dimensions are defined in §2.3; the Chow-weight homology groups $CWH_{*,K}^*(M)$ and $CWH_{*,K}^{*,*}(M)$ of M are introduced in §3.1; their "Poincare dual" Chow-weight cohomology groups $CWC_{*,*}^{*,K}(M)$ and $CWC_{*,*}^{*,K}(M)$ are introduced in §4.2.

We will treat both the characteristic 0 and the positive characteristic case below. Yet the reader may certainly assume that the characteristic of k is 0 throughout the paper (this allows to ignore all the perfectness issues along with the condition $1/p \in R$).

The authors are deeply grateful to prof. M. Levine and prof. M. Ivanov for their interesting comments, and to prof. S. Kelly for an interesting discussion on homology theories closely related to Chow-weight homology (see [KeS14]).

1 Some preliminaries on weight structures

This section is dedicated to recalling the theory of weight structures in triangulated categories.

In §1.1 we introduce some notation and conventions for (mostly, triangulated) categories; we also prove two simple lemmas.

In §1.2 we recall the definition and basic properties of weight structures.

In §1.3 we relate weight structures to localizations.

In §1.4 we recall several properties of weight complexes and weight spectral sequences.

1.1 Some (categorical) notation and lemmas

- For $a \leq b \in \mathbb{Z}$ we will write $[a, b]$ (resp. $[a, +\infty)$, resp. $[a, +\infty]$) for the set $\{i \in \mathbb{Z} : a \leq i \leq b\}$ (resp. $\{i \in \mathbb{Z} : i \geq a\}$, resp. $[a, +\infty) \cup \{+\infty\} \subset \mathbb{Z} \cup \{+\infty\}$); we will never consider real line segments in this paper. Respectively, when we will write $i \geq c$ (for $c \in \mathbb{Z}$) we will mean that i is an integer satisfying this inequality.
- Given a category C and $X, Y \in \text{Obj } C$ we will write $C(X, Y)$ for the set of morphisms from X to Y in C .
- For categories C', C we write $C' \subset C$ if C' is a full subcategory of C .
- Given a category C and $X, Y \in \text{Obj } C$, we say that X is a *retract* of Y if id_X can be factored through Y .⁴
- An additive subcategory $\underline{H}$ of additive category C is called *Karoubi-closed* in C if it contains all retracts of its objects in C . The full subcategory $\text{Kar}_C(\underline{H})$ of additive category C whose objects are all retracts of objects of a subcategory $\underline{H}$ (in C) will be called the *Karoubi-closure* of $\underline{H}$ in C .
- The *Karoubi envelope* $\text{Kar}(B)$ (no lower index) of an additive category B is the category of “formal images” of idempotents in B . So, its objects are the pairs (A, p) for $A \in \text{Obj } B$, $p \in B(A, A)$, $p^2 = p$, and the morphisms are given by the formula

$$\text{Kar}(B)((X, p), (X', p')) = \{f \in B(X, X') : p' \circ f = f \circ p = f\}.$$

The correspondence $A \mapsto (A, \text{id}_A)$ (for $A \in \text{Obj } B$) fully embeds B into $\text{Kar}(B)$. Moreover, $\text{Kar}(B)$ is *Karoubian*, i.e., any idempotent morphism yields a direct sum decomposition in $\text{Kar}(B)$. Recall also that $\text{Kar}(B)$ is triangulated if B is (see [BaS01]).

- The symbol $\underline{C}$ below will always denote some triangulated category; usually it will be endowed with a weight structure w .
- For any $A, B, C \in \text{Obj } \underline{C}$ we will say that C is an *extension* of B by A if there exists a distinguished triangle $A \rightarrow C \rightarrow B \rightarrow A[1]$.
- A class $D \subset \text{Obj } \underline{C}$ is said to be *extension-closed* if it is closed with respect to extensions and contains 0. We will call the smallest extension-closed subclass of objects of $\underline{C}$ that contains a given class $B \subset \text{Obj } \underline{C}$ the *extension-closure* of B .

⁴Certainly, if C is triangulated or abelian, then X is a retract of Y if and only if X is its direct summand.

- Given a class D of objects of $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$ we will write $\langle D \rangle$ for the smallest full Karoubi-closed triangulated subcategory of $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$ containing D . We will call $\langle D \rangle$ the triangulated category *strongly generated* by D .
- For $X, Y \in \text{Obj } \underline{\mathcal{C}}$ we will write $X \perp Y$ if $\underline{\mathcal{C}}(X, Y) = \{0\}$. For $D, E \subset \text{Obj } \underline{\mathcal{C}}$ we write $D \perp E$ if $X \perp Y$ for all $X \in D, Y \in E$. Given $D \subset \text{Obj } \underline{\mathcal{C}}$ we will write $D^\perp$ for the class

$$\{Y \in \text{Obj } \underline{\mathcal{C}} : X \perp Y \ \forall X \in D\}.$$

Dually, ${}^\perp D$ is the class $\{Y \in \text{Obj } \underline{\mathcal{C}} : Y \perp X \ \forall X \in D\}$.

- Given $f \in \underline{\mathcal{C}}(X, Y)$, where $X, Y \in \text{Obj } \underline{\mathcal{C}}$, we will call the third vertex of (any) distinguished triangle $X \xrightarrow{f} Y \rightarrow Z$ a *cone* of f .⁵
- For an additive category B we write $K(B)$ for the homotopy category of (cohomological) complexes over B . Its full subcategory of bounded complexes will be denoted by $K^b(B)$. We will write $M = (M^i)$ if M^i are the terms of the complex M .
- Note yet that we will call any (covariant) homological functor a homology theory. So, for a complex $A = (A^i, d^i)$ of abelian groups we call the quotient $\text{Ker } d^i / \text{Im } d^{i-1}$ the i -th **homology** of A (in particular, we use this "cohomological" convention for the Chow-weight homology theory).

1.2 Weight structures: basics

Let us recall the definition of the notion that is central for this paper.

Definition 1.2.1. I. A pair of subclasses $\underline{\mathcal{C}}_{w \leq 0}, \underline{\mathcal{C}}_{w \geq 0} \subset \text{Obj } \underline{\mathcal{C}}$ will be said to define a weight structure w for a triangulated category $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$ if they satisfy the following conditions.

(i) $\underline{\mathcal{C}}_{w \geq 0}, \underline{\mathcal{C}}_{w \leq 0}$ are Karoubi-closed in $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$ (i.e., contain all $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$ -retracts of their objects).

(ii) **Semi-invariance with respect to translations.**

$$\underline{\mathcal{C}}_{w \leq 0} \subset \underline{\mathcal{C}}_{w \leq 0}[1], \underline{\mathcal{C}}_{w \geq 0}[1] \subset \underline{\mathcal{C}}_{w \geq 0}.$$

(iii) **Orthogonality.**

$$\underline{\mathcal{C}}_{w \leq 0} \perp \underline{\mathcal{C}}_{w \geq 0}[1].$$

(iv) **Weight decompositions.**

For any $M \in \text{Obj } \underline{\mathcal{C}}$ there exists a distinguished triangle

$$X \rightarrow M \rightarrow Y \rightarrow X[1]$$

such that $X \in \underline{\mathcal{C}}_{w \leq 0}, Y \in \underline{\mathcal{C}}_{w \geq 0}[1]$.

We will also need the following definitions.

Definition 1.2.2. Let $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$.

1. The category $\underline{H}w \subset \underline{\mathcal{C}}$ whose objects are $\underline{\mathcal{C}}_{w=0} = \underline{\mathcal{C}}_{w \geq 0} \cap \underline{\mathcal{C}}_{w \leq 0}$ and morphisms are $\underline{H}w(Z, T) = \underline{\mathcal{C}}(Z, T)$ for $Z, T \in \underline{\mathcal{C}}_{w=0}$, is called the *heart* of w .

⁵Recall that different choices of cones are connected by non-unique isomorphisms.

2. $\underline{\mathcal{C}}_{w \geq i}$ (resp. $\underline{\mathcal{C}}_{w \leq i}$, resp. $\underline{\mathcal{C}}_{w=i}$) will denote $\underline{\mathcal{C}}_{w \geq 0}[i]$ (resp. $\underline{\mathcal{C}}_{w \leq 0}[i]$, resp. $\underline{\mathcal{C}}_{w=0}[i]$).
3. $\underline{\mathcal{C}}_{[i,j]}$ denotes $\underline{\mathcal{C}}_{w \geq i} \cap \underline{\mathcal{C}}_{w \leq j}$; so, this class equals $\{0\}$ if $i > j$.
 $\underline{\mathcal{C}}^b \subset \underline{\mathcal{C}}$ will be the category whose object class is $\cup_{i,j \in \mathbb{Z}} \underline{\mathcal{C}}_{[i,j]}$.
4. We will say that $(\underline{\mathcal{C}}, w)$ is *bounded* if $\underline{\mathcal{C}}^b = \underline{\mathcal{C}}$ (i.e., if $\cup_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \underline{\mathcal{C}}_{w \leq i} = \text{Obj } \underline{\mathcal{C}} = \cup_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \underline{\mathcal{C}}_{w \geq i}$).
5. Let $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$ and $\underline{\mathcal{C}}'$ be triangulated categories endowed with weight structures w and w' , respectively; let $F : \underline{\mathcal{C}} \rightarrow \underline{\mathcal{C}}'$ be an exact functor.
 F is said to be *weight-exact* (with respect to w, w') if it maps $\underline{\mathcal{C}}_{w \leq 0}$ into $\underline{\mathcal{C}}'_{w' \leq 0}$ and maps $\underline{\mathcal{C}}_{w \geq 0}$ into $\underline{\mathcal{C}}'_{w' \geq 0}$.
6. Let $\underline{H}$ be a full subcategory of a triangulated category $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$.
We will say that $\underline{H}$ is *negative* if $\text{Obj } \underline{H} \perp (\cup_{i > 0} \text{Obj } (\underline{H}[i]))$.

Remark 1.2.3. 1. A simple (and yet quite useful) example of a weight structure comes from the stupid filtration on $K^b(B)$ (or on $K(B)$) for an arbitrary additive category B . In this case $K^b(B)_{w \leq 0}$ (resp. $K^b(B)_{w \geq 0}$) will be the class of complexes that are homotopy equivalent to complexes concentrated in degrees ≥ 0 (resp. ≤ 0); see [BoS16b, Remark 1.2.3(1)].

The heart of this weight structure is the Karoubi-closure of B in $K^b(B)$ (or in $K(B)$, respectively).

2. A weight decomposition (of any $M \in \text{Obj } \underline{\mathcal{C}}$) is (almost) never canonical.

Yet for $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ we will often need some choice of a weight decomposition of $M[-m]$ shifted by $[m]$. So we obtain a distinguished triangle

$$w_{\leq m} M \rightarrow M \rightarrow w_{\geq m+1} M \quad (1)$$

with some $w_{\geq m+1} M \in \underline{\mathcal{C}}_{w \geq m+1}$, $w_{\leq m} M \in \underline{\mathcal{C}}_{w \leq m}$.

We will often use this notation below (though $w_{\geq m+1} M$ and $w_{\leq m} M$ are not canonically determined by M). We will call any possible choice either of $w_{\geq m+1} M$ or of $w_{\leq m} M$ (for any $m \in \mathbb{Z}$) a *weight truncation* of M .

3. In the current paper we use the “homological convention” for weight structures; it was previously used in [Wil09], [Bon13], [Bon15b], [Bon16a], and in [BoS16b], whereas in [Bon10a] and in [Bon10b] the “cohomological convention” was used. In the latter convention the roles of $\underline{\mathcal{C}}_{w \leq 0}$ and $\underline{\mathcal{C}}_{w \geq 0}$ are interchanged, i.e., one considers $\underline{\mathcal{C}}^{w \leq 0} = \underline{\mathcal{C}}_{w \geq 0}$ and $\underline{\mathcal{C}}^{w \geq 0} = \underline{\mathcal{C}}_{w \leq 0}$. So, a complex $X \in \text{Obj } K(\underline{A})$ whose only non-zero term is the fifth one (i.e., $X^5 \neq 0$) has weight -5 in the homological convention, and has weight 5 in the cohomological convention. Thus the conventions differ by “signs of weights”; $K(\underline{A})_{[i,j]}$ is the class of retracts of complexes concentrated in degrees $[-j, -i]$.

We also recall that D. Pauksztello has introduced weight structures independently in [Pau08]; he called them co-t-structures.

4. The orthogonality axiom (iii) in Definition 1.2.1 immediately yields that $\underline{Hw}$ is negative in $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$. We will formulate a certain converse to this statement below.

Let us recall some basic properties of weight structures. Starting from this moment we will assume that all the weight structures we consider are bounded (unless specified otherwise; this is quite sufficient for our purposes everywhere except in the proof of Proposition 3.1.2(6)).

Proposition 1.2.4. *Let $\underline{C}$ be a triangulated category, $n \geq 0$; we will assume that w is a fixed (bounded) weight structure on $\underline{C}$ everywhere except in assertion 7.*

1. *The axiomatics of weight structures is self-dual, i.e., for $\underline{D} = \underline{C}^{op}$ (so $\text{Obj } \underline{D} = \text{Obj } \underline{C}$) there exists the (opposite) weight structure w' for which $\underline{D}_{w'=0} = \underline{C}_{w \geq 0}$ and $\underline{D}_{w' \geq 0} = \underline{C}_{w \leq 0}$.*
2. *If $M \in \underline{C}_{w \geq -n}$ then $w_{\leq 0}M \in \underline{C}_{[-n,0]}$.*
3. *$\underline{C}_{w \leq 0}$ is the extension-closure of $\cup_{i \leq 0} \underline{C}_{w=i}$ in $\underline{C}$; $\underline{C}_{w \geq 0}$ is the extension-closure of $\cup_{i \geq 0} \underline{C}_{w=i}$ in $\underline{C}$.*
4. *$\underline{C}_{w \geq 0} = (\underline{C}_{w \leq -1})^\perp$ and $\underline{C}_{w \leq 0} = {}^\perp \underline{C}_{w \geq 1}$.*
5. *Assume that w' is a weight structure for a triangulated category $\underline{C}'$. Then an exact functor $F : \underline{C} \rightarrow \underline{C}'$ is weight-exact if and only if $F(\underline{C}_{w=0}) \subset \underline{C}_{w'=0}$.*
6. *Let $m \leq l \in \mathbb{Z}$, $X, X' \in \text{Obj } \underline{C}$; fix certain weight decompositions of $X[-m]$ and $X'[-l]$. Then any morphism $g : X \rightarrow X'$ can be extended to a commutative diagram of the corresponding distinguished triangles (see Remark 1.2.3(2)):*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} w_{\leq m}X & \longrightarrow & X & \longrightarrow & w_{\geq m+1}X \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow g & & \downarrow \\ w_{\leq l}X' & \longrightarrow & X' & \longrightarrow & w_{\geq l+1}X' \end{array}$$

Moreover, if $m < l$ then this extension is unique (provided that the rows are fixed).

7. *For a triangulated category $\underline{C}$ let $D \subset \text{Obj } \underline{C}$ be a negative additive subcategory. Then there exists a unique weight structure w_T on $T = \langle D \rangle_{\underline{C}}$ such that $D \subset T_{w_T=0}$. It is bounded; its heart equals the Karoubi-closure of D in $\underline{C}$. Moreover, T is Karoubian whenever D is.*
Furthermore, if there exists a weight structure w for $\underline{C}$ such that $D \subset \underline{H}w$, then the embedding $T \rightarrow \underline{C}$ is strictly weight-exact, i.e., $T_{w_T \leq 0} = \text{Obj } T \cap \underline{C}_{w \leq 0}$ and $T_{w_T \geq 0} = \text{Obj } T \cap \underline{C}_{w \geq 0}$.
8. *For any $M, N \in \text{Obj } \underline{C}$ and $f \in \underline{C}(N, M)$ if $M \in \underline{C}_{w \geq 0}$, then f factors through (any possible choice of) $w_{\geq 0}N$. Dually, if $N \in \underline{C}_{w \leq 0}$ then f factors through $w_{\leq 0}M$.*
9. *Let $\underline{D}$ be a (full) triangulated subcategory of $\underline{C}$ such that w restricts to $\underline{D}$ (i.e., $\text{Obj } \underline{D} \cap \underline{C}_{w \leq 0}$ and $\text{Obj } \underline{D} \cap \underline{C}_{w \geq 0}$ give a weight structure for $\underline{D}$); let $M \in \underline{C}_{w \leq 0}$, $N \in \underline{C}_{w \geq -n}$, and $f \in \underline{C}(M, N)$. Suppose that f factors through an object P of $\underline{D}$, i.e., there exist $u_1 \in \underline{C}(M, P)$ and $u_2 \in \underline{C}(P, N)$ such that $f = u_2 \circ u_1$. Then f factors through an element of $\underline{D}_{[-n,0]}$.*

Proof. All of these statements except the three last ones were proved in [Bon10a] and in [Bon10b] (pay attention to Remark 1.2.3(3)!).

Assertion 7 is given by Remark 2.1.2 of [BoS16b].⁶

Assertion 8 is an easy consequence of assertion 6.

9. Assertion 8 yields that u_2 factors through $w_{\geq -n}P$; so we can assume $P \in \underline{D}_{w_{\geq -n}}$. Next, the dual to assertion 8 (see assertion 1) yields that u_1 factors through $w_{\leq 0}P$. It remains to note that we can choose $w_{\leq 0}P \in \underline{D}_{[-n,0]}$ (see assertion 2). □

1.3 Weight structures in localizations

We call a category $\frac{A}{B}$ the *factor* of an additive category A by its full additive subcategory B if $\text{Obj}(\frac{A}{B}) = \text{Obj } A$ and $(\frac{A}{B})(X, Y) = A(X, Y) / (\sum_{Z \in \text{Obj } B} A(Z, Y) \circ A(X, Z))$.

Proposition 1.3.1. *Let $\underline{D} \subset \underline{C}$ be a triangulated subcategory of $\underline{C}$; suppose that w induces a weight structure $w_{\underline{D}}$ on $\underline{D}$ (i.e., $\text{Obj } \underline{D} \cap \underline{C}_{w_{\leq 0}}$ and $\text{Obj } \underline{D} \cap \underline{C}_{w_{\geq 0}}$ give a weight structure for $\underline{D}$). Denote by l the localization functor $\underline{C} \rightarrow \underline{C}/\underline{D}$ (the latter category is the Verdier quotient of $\underline{C}$ by $\underline{D}$).*

Then the following statements are valid.

1. *w induces a weight structure on $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$, i.e., the Karoubi-closures of $l(\underline{C}_{w_{\leq 0}})$ and $l(\underline{C}_{w_{\geq 0}})$ give a weight structure for $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$.*
2. *Suppose $(\underline{C}, w)$ is bounded. For $X \in \text{Obj } \underline{C}$ assume that $l(X) \in \underline{C}/\underline{D}_{w_{\underline{C}/\underline{D}} \geq 0}$. Then X is an extension of some element of $\underline{C}_{w_{\geq 0}}$ by an element of $\underline{D}_{w_{\underline{D}} \leq -1}$ (see §1.1).*
3. *The heart $\underline{H}w_{\underline{C}/\underline{D}}$ of the weight structure $w_{\underline{C}/\underline{D}}$ obtained is the Karoubi-closure of (the natural image of) $\frac{\underline{H}w}{\underline{H}w_{\underline{D}}}$ in $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$.*
4. *If $(\underline{C}, w)$ is bounded, then $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$ also is.*

Proof. Assertions 1, 3, and 4 were proved in §8.1 of [Bon10a]; assertion 2 is given by Remark 3.2.6 of [Sos15] (cf. Remark 1.3.2(3)). □

Remark 1.3.2. 1. Certainly, if the conditions of the proposition are fulfilled, the functor l is weight-exact with respect to the corresponding weight structures.

Now assume that $l(M) \in \underline{C}/\underline{D}_{w_{\underline{C}/\underline{D}} \geq -n}$ (for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}$). Then for any shifted weight decomposition $w_{\leq -n-1}M \xrightarrow{g} M \xrightarrow{h} w_{\geq -n}M$ the orthogonality axiom for $w_{\underline{C}/\underline{D}}$ yields that $l(g) = 0$. Hence $l(h)$ splits.

Conversely, assume that there exists an element N of $\underline{C}_{w_{\geq -n}}$ along with a $\underline{C}$ -morphism $h : M \rightarrow N$ such that $l(h)$ splits. Then $l(M)$ is a retract of $l(N)$, and so $l(M) \in \underline{C}/\underline{D}_{w_{\underline{C}/\underline{D}} \geq -n}$.

2. Part 2 of the proposition yields the existence of a distinguished triangle $d \rightarrow X \rightarrow c \rightarrow d[1]$ for some $c \in \underline{C}_{w_{\geq 0}}$, $d \in \underline{D}_{w_{\underline{D}} \leq -1}$. Certainly, this triangle is just a shifted weight decomposition of X . In particular, Proposition 1.2.4(3) (or part 2 of the proposition together with its dual) easily yields the following: if $X \in \underline{C}_{[l,m]}$ for $l \leq 0 \leq m$, then $c \in \underline{C}_{[0,m]}$ and $d \in \underline{C}_{[l,-1]}$.

⁶In the case of a Karoubian $\underline{C}$ (that is quite sufficient for the purposes of this paper) this result was established in [Bon10a].

3. If w is bounded then all weight structures compatible with it (for $\underline{D} \subset \underline{C}$) come from additive subcategories of $\underline{Hw}$ (see Proposition 1.2.4(7,5)). Yet to ensure that there exists a weight structure for $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$ such that the localization functor is weight-exact it actually suffices to assume that $\underline{D}$ is strongly generated by some set of elements of $\underline{C}_{[0,1]}$; see Theorem 4.2.2 of [BoS16a] (and Theorem 4.1.3 of [Sos15] for a more general statement).

1.4 On weight complexes and weight spectral sequences

We will need certain *weight complexes* below. Applying the results of (§6 of) [Bon10a], one can assume that all the weight complexes we need are given by "compatible" exact functors whose targets are the corresponding $K^b(\underline{Hw})$. Yet (see §3 of *ibid.*) one cannot construct canonical weight complex functors satisfying these properties without considering certain "enhancements" for their domains; so here we just define weight complexes of objects and do not treat weight complexes of morphisms (explicitly; yet cf. Proposition 1.4.2(6)).

Definition 1.4.1. For an object M of $\underline{C}$ (where $\underline{C}$ is endowed with a weight structure w) choose some $w_{\leq l}M$ (see Remark 1.2.3(2)) for all $l \in \mathbb{Z}$. For all $l \in \mathbb{Z}$ connect $w_{\leq l-1}M$ with $w_{\leq l}M$ using Proposition 1.2.4(6) (i.e., we consider those unique connecting morphisms that are compatible with id_M). Next, take the corresponding triangles

$$w_{\leq l-1}M \rightarrow w_{\leq l}M \rightarrow M^{-l}[l] \quad (2)$$

(so, we just introduce the notation for the corresponding cones). All of these triangles together with the corresponding morphisms $w_{\leq l}M \rightarrow M$ are called a choice of a *weight Postnikov tower* for M , whereas the objects M^i together with the morphisms connecting them (obtained by composing the morphisms $M^{-l} \rightarrow (w_{\leq l-1}M)[1-l] \rightarrow M^{-l+1}$ that come from two consecutive triangles of the type (2)) will be denoted by $t(M)$ and is said to be a choice of a *weight complex* for M .

Let us recall some basic properties of weight complexes (note that the boundedness of w is only needed in assertion 3 below; actually, a much weaker restriction on w is sufficient here according to Theorem 2.3.4(III) of [Bon15b]).

Proposition 1.4.2. *Let $M \in \text{Obj } \underline{C}$, where $\underline{C}$ is endowed with a weight structure w .*

Then the following statements are valid.

1. *Any choice of $t(M) = (M^i)$ is a complex indeed (i.e., the square of the boundary is zero); all M^i belong to $\underline{C}_{w=0}$.*
2. *M determines its weight complex $t(M)$ up to a homotopy equivalence. In particular, if $M \in \underline{C}_{w \geq 0}$ then any choice of $t(M)$ is $K(\underline{Hw})$ -isomorphic to a complex with non-zero terms in non-positive degrees only.*
3. *If $t(M)$ is homotopy equivalent to 0, then $M = 0$.*
4. *Let $a \leq b \in \mathbb{Z}$ and assume that $t(M)$ comes from a weight Postnikov tower (for M) such that $w_{\leq i}M = 0$ for $i < a$ and $w_{\leq b}M \cong M$. Then M belongs to the extension-closure of $\{M^{-i}[i] : a \leq i \leq b\}$.*

5. Let $N \in \underline{C}_{w=0}$, $M \in \underline{C}_{w \geq 0}$; assume that an $f \in \underline{C}(N, M)$ factors through some $L \in \text{Obj } \underline{C}$. Then for any possible choice of L^0 (i.e., of the zeroth term of $t(L)$) f can be factored through L^0 .
6. Let $H : \underline{Hw} \rightarrow \underline{A}$ ($\underline{A}$ is an arbitrary abelian category) be an additive functor. Choose a weight complex $t(M) = (M^j)$ for each $M \in \text{Obj } \underline{C}$, and denote by $\tilde{H}(M)$ the zeroth homology of the complex $H(M^*)$. Then $\tilde{H}(-)$ yields a homological functor from $\underline{C}$ to $\underline{A}$ (that does not depend on the choices of weight complexes for objects); we will call a functor of this type a w -pure one.
7. Let $\underline{C}'$ be a triangulated category endowed with a weight structure w' ; let $F : \underline{C} \rightarrow \underline{C}'$ be a weight-exact functor. Then for any choice of $t(M)$ the complex $F(M^i)$ yields a weight complex of $F(M)$ with respect to w' . Moreover, this observation is "compatible with the construction of functors" mentioned in the previous assertion, and is natural with respect to transformations of (weight-exact) functors.
8. Let $\underline{B}$ be a full subcategory of $\underline{Hw}$. Then M belongs to $\text{Kar}_{\underline{C}}(\underline{B})$ if and only if $t(M)$ belongs to $\text{Kar}_{K^b(\underline{Hw})}(\underline{B})$.

Proof. Assertions 1–3 follow immediately from Theorem 3.3.1 of [Bon10a].

Assertion 4 is easy. It suffices to note that the triangles (2) yield by induction on $i \leq b$ that the corresponding $w_{\leq i}M$ belong to the extension-closure of $\{M^{-i}[i] : a \leq i \leq b\}$ (note that this statement is certainly true for $i < a$ and applying it for $i = b$ we obtain our assertion).

Assertion 5 was essentially established in the course of proving of Proposition 1.2.4(9).

Assertion 6 is easy also; it is immediate from the dual statement given by Proposition 2.1.3(14) of [Bon13].

Assertion 7 is an immediate consequence of the definition of a weight complex (and of weight-exact functors).

Assertion 8 is given by Corollary 8.1.2 of [Bon10a]. $\square$

Remark 1.4.3. 1. Moreover, Theorem 3.3.1(VI) of [Bon10a] easily yields that t induces a bijection between the class of isomorphism classes of elements of $\underline{C}_{[0,1]}$ and the corresponding class for $K(\underline{Hw})$ (i.e., with the class of homotopy equivalence classes of complexes that have non-zero terms in degrees -1 and 0 only).

2. The term "weight complex" originates from [GiS96], where a certain complex of Chow motives was constructed for a variety X over a characteristic 0 field. The weight complex functor of Gillet and Soulé can be obtained via applying the "triangulated motivic" weight complex functor $DM_{gm}^{eff} \rightarrow K^b(\text{Chow}^{eff})$ (or $DM_{gm} \rightarrow K^b(\text{Chow})$; cf. Definition 3.1.1 below) to the *motif with compact support* of X (see Propositions 6.3.1 and 6.6.2 and Remark 6.3.2(2) of [Bon09]). Certainly, our notion of weight complex is much more general.

Now recall some of the properties of weight spectral sequences established in §2 of [Bon10a].

Let $\underline{A}$ be an abelian category. In §2 of [Bon10a] for $H : \underline{C} \rightarrow \underline{A}$ that is either cohomological or homological (i.e., it is either covariant or contravariant, and converts distinguished triangles into long exact sequences) certain *weight*

filtrations and *weight spectral sequences* (corresponding to w) were introduced. Below we will be more interested in the homological functor case; certainly, one can pass to cohomology by a simple reversion of arrows (cf. §2.4 of *ibid.*).

Definition 1.4.4. Let $H : \underline{\mathcal{C}} \rightarrow \underline{\mathcal{A}}$ be a covariant functor, $i \in \mathbb{Z}$.

1. We will write H_i for the functor $H \circ [i] : \underline{\mathcal{C}} \rightarrow \underline{\mathcal{A}}$.
2. Choose some $w_{\leq i}M$ and define the *weight filtration* for H by $W_i H : M \mapsto \text{Im}(H(w_{\leq i}M) \rightarrow H(M))$.

Recall that $W_i H(M)$ is functorial in M (in particular, it does not depend on the choice of $w_{\leq i}M$); see Proposition 2.1.2(1) of *ibid.*

Proposition 1.4.5. *For a homological $H : \underline{\mathcal{C}} \rightarrow \underline{\mathcal{A}}$ and any $M \in \text{Obj } \underline{\mathcal{C}}$ there exists a spectral sequence $T = T_w(H, M)$ with $E_1^{pq}(T) = H_q(M^p)$, where M^i and the boundary morphisms of $E_1(T)$ come from any choice of $t(M)$. $T_w(H, M)$ is $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$ -functorial in M and in H (with respect to composition of H with exact functors of abelian categories) starting from E_2 .*

It converges to $E_{\infty}^{p+q} = H_{p+q}(M)$ (at least) if M is bounded. The step of the filtration given by $(E_{\infty}^{l, m-l} : l \geq k)$ on $H_m(M)$ (for some $k, m \in \mathbb{Z}$) equals $(W_{-k}H_m)(M)$.

Corollary 1.4.6. *Let $M \in \underline{\mathcal{C}}_{w \geq 0}$, $N \in \underline{\mathcal{C}}_{w=0}$. Then the following statements are valid.*

1. *Choose some $t(M) = (M^i)$. Then $\underline{\mathcal{C}}(N, M)$ is isomorphic to the zeroth homology of $(\underline{H}w(N, M^i))$.*
2. *Let $\underline{\mathcal{D}} \subset \underline{\mathcal{C}}$ be a triangulated subcategory of $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$; suppose that w induces a weight structure on $\underline{\mathcal{D}}$ (cf. Proposition 1.3.1). Assume that $f \in \underline{\mathcal{C}}(N, M)$ vanishes in the Verdier quotient $\underline{\mathcal{C}}/\underline{\mathcal{D}}$. Then f factors through some object of $\underline{H}w_{\underline{\mathcal{D}}}$.*

Proof. 1. We may assume that $M^i = 0$ for $i > 0$ (see Proposition 1.2.4(2); note that making a choice here does not affect the homology of $(\underline{H}w(N, M^*))$), whereas certainly $N \perp M^i[-i]$ for all $i < 0$, $N \perp M^i[-i-1]$ for all $i < -1$. Hence the spectral sequence $E_1^{pq} = \underline{\mathcal{C}}(N, M^p[q]) \implies \underline{\mathcal{C}}(N, M[p+q])$ (this is the weight spectral sequence for the homological functor $\underline{\mathcal{C}}(N, -) : \underline{\mathcal{C}} \rightarrow \text{Ab}$; see Proposition 1.4.5) yields the result.

2. The Verdier localization theory yields that f factors through an object of $\underline{\mathcal{D}}$. Hence the assertion follows from Proposition 1.4.2(5). $\square$

Remark 1.4.7. Note that (for a fixed H, q) the functor $M \mapsto E_2^{0q}(T_w(H, M))$ is a particular case of w -pure functors mentioned in Proposition 1.4.26. Some (other) interesting functors of this type were considered in [KeS14] and in [Bach15]; cf. also Corollary 2.3.4 of [Bon13].

2 On motives, their weights, and various (complexes of) Chow groups

In this section we study several motivic categories, Chow weight structures for them, and certain (complexes of) Chow groups.

In §2.1 we recall some basics on Voevodsky motives with coefficients in a $\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]$ -algebra R and introduce some notation.

In §2.2 we introduce and study in detail the Chow weight structures on various versions of DM_{gm}^R .

In §2.3 we associate to extensions of k and complexes of Chow motives the homology of complexes consisting of their Chow groups (of fixed dimension and "highness"). We prove several properties of these homology theories (and of motivic homology). Most of these statements seem to be standard; yet to establish a relation between the corresponding homology over K/k with that over its residue field, we invoke certain splitting results from [Bon10b] and [Bon13].

2.1 Some notation and basics on Voevodsky motives

Below k will denote a perfect base field of characteristic p ; we set $\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}] = \mathbb{Z}$ if $p = 0$. Denote the set of smooth varieties (resp. of smooth projective varieties) over k by $SmVar$ (resp. by $SmPrVar$).

Recall that (as was shown in [MVW06]; cf. also [CiD15]), one can do the theory of motives with coefficients in an arbitrary commutative associative ring with a unit R . One should start with the naturally defined category of R -correspondences: $\text{Obj}(SmCor_R) = SmVar$; for $X, Y \in SmVar$ we set $SmCor_R(X, Y) = \bigoplus_U R$ for all integral closed $U \subset X \times Y$ that are finite over X and also dominant over a connected component of X . Below we will always assume in addition that R is an $\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]$ -algebra.

Proceeding as in [Voe00a] (i.e., taking the corresponding localization of $K^b(SmCor_R)$, and complexes of sheaves with transfers with homotopy invariant cohomology) one obtains the theory of motives (i.e., of the tensor triangulated category $DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$ along with its embeddings into DM_{gm}^R and into DM_{-R}^{eff} ; see below) that satisfies all the basic properties of the 'usual' Voevodsky's motives (i.e., of those with integral coefficients for $p = 0$). Being more precise, we recall that all of the results that were stated in [Voe00a] in this case are currently known for $\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]$ -motives (also if) $p > 0$; see [Kel12], [Deg08], and [Bon11]. So we will apply some of these properties of motives with R -coefficients without further mention. We will mostly be interested in the cases $R = \mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]$ and $R = \mathbb{Q}$. Note also that the results of [Kel12] are proved in the case of an arbitrary p ; so we will usually cite them without mentioning their well-known analogues from [Voe00a] established in the case $p = 0$ only. Still the reader can certainly restrict himself to the case $p = 0$; this would yield certain simplifications of the proofs (that include ignoring all the perfectness issues).

We note that the composition $SmCor_R \rightarrow K^b(SmCor_R) \rightarrow DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$ certainly yields a functor M_{gm}^R (of the R -motif) from the category of smooth k -varieties into $DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$. Actually, it extends to the category of all k -varieties (see [Voe00a] and [Kel12]); yet we will rarely need this extension.

$\underline{Chow}_R^{eff} \subset DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$ will denote the category of R -linear effective homological Chow motives (considered as a full subcategory of $DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$; we will also assume it to be strict for convenience). For $c \geq 0$ and $M \in \text{Obj } DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$ we will write $M\langle c \rangle$ for the tensor product of M by the c th tensor power of the Lefschetz motif $\mathbb{L}$; whereas $\mathbb{L}^{\otimes c}$ will sometimes be denoted by $R(c)[2c]$ following the notation of [Voe00a]. Respectively, the symbol $M(c)$ will denote the tensor product $M \otimes R(c) = M \otimes \mathbb{L}^{\otimes c}[-2c]$.

Next, recall that the functor $-\langle 1 \rangle$ is a full embedding of $DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$ into it-

self that restricts to an embedding of $\underline{Chow}_R^{eff}$ into itself. It extends to an autoequivalence of the corresponding category $DM_{gm}^R = DM_{gm,R}^{eff}[\langle -1 \rangle]$ (i.e., we invert $- \otimes \mathbb{L}$); recall that this category contains $DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$ and $\underline{Chow}_R = \underline{Chow}_R^{eff}[\langle -1 \rangle]$. Moreover, DM_{gm}^R is equipped with an exact Poincare duality functor $\hat{-} : DM_{gm}^R \rightarrow DM_{gm}^{R,op}$ (constructed in [Voe00a] for $p = 0$; see Theorem 5.5.14 of [Kel12] or [Bon11] for the positive characteristic case) that sends $M_{gm}^R(P)$ into $M_{gm}^R(P)\langle -d \rangle$ if P is smooth projective everywhere of dimension d . It restricts to the "usual" Poincare duality for $\underline{Chow}_R$.

Both $DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$ and DM_{gm}^R are Karoubian by definition.

An important property of motives is the Gysin distinguished triangle (see Proposition 4.3 of [Deg08] that establishes its existence in the case of an arbitrary p). For a closed embedding $Z \rightarrow X$ of smooth varieties, Z is everywhere of codimension c in X , it has the following form:

$$M_{gm}^R(X \setminus Z) \rightarrow M_{gm}^R(X) \rightarrow M_{gm}^R(Z)\langle c \rangle \rightarrow M_{gm}^R(X \setminus Z)[1]. \quad (3)$$

Remark 2.1.1. Some of our formulations below will mention the homotopy t -structure for the Voevodsky motivic complexes. So we recall that the methods of [Voe00a] yield an embedding $DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$ into a certain category DM_{-R}^{eff} , whereas the latter can be endowed with the so-called homotopy t -structure t_{hom}^R . Furthermore, the arguments of [Deg11] yield an embedding of DM_{-R}^{eff} into the triangulated category DM_R^{eff} of unbounded motivic complexes that is closed with respect to arbitrary coproducts. t_{hom}^R can be extended to DM_R^{eff} (see Corollary 5.2 of *ibid.*) so that the class $DM_R^{eff, t_{hom}^R \leq 0}$ coincides with $DM_{-R}^{eff, t_{hom}^R \leq 0}$; it also equals the smallest extension-closed subclass of $\text{Obj } DM_R^{eff}$ that is closed with respect to coproducts and contains $M_{gm}^R(X)$ for all smooth X/k .

We will give another description of $DM_R^{eff, t_{hom}^R \leq 0}$ (in terms of Chow motives) in the proof of Proposition 3.1.2(6) below.

2.2 Chow weight structures for motivic categories and their applications

Now we note that the arguments used in the construction of the *Chow weight structures* in [Bon10a] and [Bon11] can be easily applied to R -motives (for any $\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]$ -algebra R).

Proposition 2.2.1. *1. There exists a bounded weight structure w_{Chow} for $DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$ (resp. for DM_{gm}^R) whose heart equals $\underline{Chow}_R^{eff}$ (resp. $\underline{Chow}_R$; recall that we assume this subcategories of DM_{gm}^R to be strict). These weight structures for $DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$ and DM_{gm}^R are compatible (i.e., the embedding $DM_{gm,R}^{eff} \rightarrow DM_{gm}^R$ is weight-exact).*

Moreover, $DM_{gm,R}^{eff, w \leq 0}$ (resp. $DM_{gm}^{R, w \leq 0}$) is the extension-closure of the set $\cup_{i \geq 0} \text{Obj } \underline{Chow}_R^{eff}[i]$ in $DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$ (resp. of the set $\cup_{i \geq 0} \text{Obj } \underline{Chow}_R[i]$ in DM_{gm}^R); $DM_{gm,R}^{eff, w \geq 0}$ (resp. $DM_{gm}^{R, w \geq 0}$) is the extension-closure of $\cup_{i \leq 0} \text{Obj } \underline{Chow}_R^{eff}[i]$ in $DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$ (resp. of $\cup_{i \leq 0} \text{Obj } \underline{Chow}_R[i]$ in DM_{gm}^R).

2. If $U \in \text{SmVar}$, $\dim U \leq m$, then $M_{gm}^R(U) \in DM_{gm,R}^{eff}[-m, 0]$.

3. If $U \rightarrow V$ is an open dense embedding of smooth varieties, then the motif $\text{Cone}(M_{gm}^R(U) \rightarrow M_{gm}^R(V))$ belongs to $DM_{gm,R}^{eff} w_{Chow} \leq 0$.
4. Let k' be a perfect field extension of k . Then the extension of scalars functors $DM_{gm,R}^{eff}(k) \rightarrow DM_{gm,R}^{eff}(k')$ and $DM_{gm}^R(k) \rightarrow DM_{gm}^R(k')$ are weight-exact with respect to the corresponding Chow weight structures.
5. For any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ the functor $-\langle n \rangle$ is weight-exact on DM_{gm}^R ; the same is true for $DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$ if $n \geq 0$.
6. If $M \in \text{Obj } DM_{gm,R}^{eff} \langle n \rangle$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, then there exists a choice of $t(M) = (M^i)$ (with respect to the Chow weight structure for $DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$) with $M^i \in \text{Obj } \underline{Chow}_R^{eff} \langle n \rangle$.

Proof. The first three assertions were stated in Theorem 2.2.1 of [Bon11] in the case $R = \mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]$; the proof carries over to the case of a general R without any difficulty.

The remaining assertions are easy also. Assertions 4 and 5 are immediate from Proposition 1.2.4(5), whereas assertion 6 follows from the previous one by Proposition 1.4.2(7). $\square$

Now we deduce some simple corollaries from this proposition. Their formulation requires the following definition, that will be very important for us below.

Definition 2.2.2. 1. For $M \in \text{Obj } DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$ and c being a non-negative integer we will say that M is c -effective if it has the form $N \langle c \rangle$ for some $N \in \text{Obj } DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$.

2. We will say that the dimension of M is not greater than an integer m if M belongs to $\langle M_{gm}^R(P) : P \in \text{SmPrVar}, \dim P \leq m \rangle$.

The (full) triangulated subcategory of $DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$ (resp. of $\underline{Chow}_R^{eff}$) of motives of dimension $\leq m$ will be denoted by $d_{\leq m} DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$ (resp., by $d_{\leq m} \underline{Chow}_R^{eff}$; so, $d_{\leq m} DM_{gm,R}^{eff} = d_{\leq m} \underline{Chow}_R^{eff} = \{0\}$ if $m < 0$).

3. We will write $DM_{gm}^R{}^c$ for the Verdier quotient $DM_{gm,R}^{eff} / DM_{gm,R}^{eff} \langle c+1 \rangle$; l^c will denote the corresponding localization functor.

4. In the following section we will also need the following extension of this notation: $\underline{Chow}_R^{eff} \langle +\infty \rangle = DM_{gm,R}^{eff} \langle +\infty \rangle = \{0\}$, $l^{+\infty} = l^{+\infty-1}$ will denote the identity functor for $DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$. Respectively, $DM_{gm,R}^{eff+\infty} = DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$, and any subclass of objects of $DM_{gm,R}^{eff} \langle +\infty \rangle$ is zero.

Remark 2.2.3. If $p = 0$ then the arguments of [Voe00a] easily yield that $M_{gm}^R(X) \in \text{Obj } d_{\leq m} DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$ if V is an arbitrary k -variety of dimension $\leq m$. For $p > 0$ this result can be easily established via the methods of §5.5 of [Kel12] (or of [Bon11] if V is smooth; this case of the statement is quite sufficient for the purposes of the current paper).

Corollary 2.2.4. Let $c \geq 1$, $m \geq 0$.

1. The Chow weight structure restricts to a weight structure on the category $DM_{gm,R}^{eff} \langle c \rangle$, i.e., there exists a weight structure w^c for $DM_{gm,R}^{eff} \langle c \rangle \subset DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$ such that $DM_{gm,R}^{eff} \langle c \rangle_{w^c \leq 0} = DM_{gm,R}^{eff} w_{Chow} \leq 0 \cap \text{Obj } DM_{gm,R}^{eff} \langle c \rangle$, $DM_{gm,R}^{eff} \langle c \rangle_{w^c \geq 0} = DM_{gm,R}^{eff} w_{Chow} \leq 0 \cap \text{Obj } DM_{gm,R}^{eff} \langle c \rangle$, and $DM_{gm,R}^{eff} \langle c \rangle_{w^c = 0} = DM_{gm,R}^{eff} w_{Chow} = 0 \cap \text{Obj } DM_{gm,R}^{eff} \langle c \rangle$.

$\text{Obj } DM_{gm,R}^{eff}\langle c \rangle$. Moreover, $DM_{gm,R}^{eff} w^c \leq 0 = DM_{gm,R}^{eff} w_{Chow} \leq 0 \langle c \rangle$, $DM_{gm,R}^{eff} w^c \geq 0 = DM_{gm,R}^{eff} w_{Chow} \geq 0 \langle c \rangle$.

2. An object M of $\underline{Chow}_R^{eff}$ is c -effective (as an object of $DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$) if and only if it can be presented as $N\langle c \rangle$ for $N \in DM_{gm,R}^{eff} w_{Chow} = 0$.

3. The Chow weight structure also restricts to a weight structure on the category $d_{\leq m} DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$ (that will also be denoted by w_{Chow}). Its heart consists of all objects of $\underline{Chow}_R^{eff}$ inside this category; these motives are exactly retracts of $M_{gm}^R(P)$ for smooth projective P/k of dimension $\leq m$.

4. If $U \rightarrow V$ is an open embedding of smooth varieties such that $V \setminus U$ is everywhere of codimension c in V , $\dim V \leq m$, then $\text{Cone}(M_{gm}(U) \rightarrow M_{gm}^R(V)) \in (d_{\leq m-c} DM_{gm,R}^{eff})_{w_{Chow} \leq 0} \langle c \rangle$.

Proof. 1. Note that $DM_{gm,R}^{eff}\langle c \rangle$ is exactly the subcategory of $DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$ strongly generated by $\text{Obj } \underline{Chow}_R^{eff}\langle c \rangle$. Hence Proposition 1.2.4(7,3) yields the result immediately.

2. This is an immediate consequence of the "moreover" part of the previous assertion (since $-\langle c \rangle$ yields an equivalence of $DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$ with $DM_{gm,R}^{eff}\langle c \rangle$).

3. Immediate from Proposition 1.2.4(7) once again.

4. There certainly exists a chain of open embeddings $U = U_0 \rightarrow U_1 \rightarrow U_2 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow U_m = V$ (for some $m \geq 1$) such that $U_i \setminus U_{i-1}$ are smooth for all $1 \leq i \leq m$. Hence the distinguished triangles (3) along with Remark 2.2.3 imply (by induction on m) that $\text{Cone}(M_{gm}(U) \rightarrow M_{gm}^R(V)) \in \text{Obj}(d_{\leq m-c} DM_{gm,R}^{eff})\langle c \rangle$. Thus it remains to combine the equality

$$((d_{\leq m-c} DM_{gm,R}^{eff})\langle c \rangle)_{w^c \leq 0} = ((d_{\leq m-c} DM_{gm,R}^{eff})_{w_{Chow} \leq 0})\langle c \rangle$$

(cf. assertion 1 and its proof) with Proposition 2.2.1(3). $\square$

Remark 2.2.5. Let $l \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $c \geq 1$, and assume that there exists a choice of $w_{Chow \leq l} M$ that belongs to $\text{Obj } DM_{gm,R}^{eff}\langle c \rangle$.

1. Suppose moreover that there exists $w_{Chow \leq l-1} M \in \text{Obj } DM_{gm,R}^{eff}\langle c \rangle$. Then the corresponding choice (see (2)) of M^{-l} certainly (see Proposition 1.2.4(3)) belongs to $DM_{gm,R}^{eff} w_{Chow} = 0$ as well as to $\text{Obj } DM_{gm,R}^{eff}\langle c \rangle$ (since $DM_{gm,R}^{eff}\langle c \rangle$ is a full triangulated subcategory of $DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$). Thus $M^{-l} \in DM_{gm,R}^{eff} w_{Chow} = 0 \langle c \rangle$.

2. Now suppose that $M \in DM_{gm,R}^{eff} w_{Chow \leq l}$. Then M is a retract of $w_{Chow \leq l} M$ (since id_M factors through $w_{Chow \leq l} M$ by Proposition 1.2.4(8)). Thus M is an object of $DM_{gm,R}^{eff}\langle c \rangle$ also.

Let us deduce some more lemmas that will be very important for us below.

Proposition 2.2.6. *Let $m, j \geq 0$, $c \geq 1$.*

1. *Let $u : U \rightarrow V$ be an open embedding of smooth varieties such that $V \setminus U$ is everywhere of codimension $\geq c$ in V and $\dim V \leq m$. Let $M \in DM_{gm}^R w_{Chow} \geq 0$, and assume that $g \in DM_{gm}^R(M_{gm}^R(V)\langle j \rangle, M)$ vanishes when composed with $M_{gm}^R(u)\langle j \rangle$. Then there exists a smooth projective P/k of dimension $\leq m - c$ such that g factors through $M_{gm}^R(P)\langle j + c \rangle$.*

2. Any morphism $q : M_{gm}^R(Q) \rightarrow N\langle c \rangle$ for $N \in \text{Obj } \underline{\text{Chow}}_R^{eff}$ and a smooth projective Q of dimension $\leq m$ can be factored through $M_{gm}^R(P)\langle c \rangle$ for some smooth projective P/k of dimension $\leq m - c$.

3. $\text{Obj } d_{\leq m} DM_{gm,R}^{eff} \cap \text{Obj } DM_{gm,R}^{eff}\langle c \rangle = \text{Obj}(d_{\leq m-c} DM_{gm,R}^{eff})\langle c \rangle$.

In particular, if $N \in \text{Obj } \underline{\text{Chow}}_R^{eff}$ and $N\langle c \rangle$ is of dimension $\leq m$ (in $DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$), then N is of dimension $\leq m - c$ (so, it is zero if $c > m$).

4. Let $M \in \text{Obj } \underline{\text{Chow}}_R^{eff}$ and $g \in DM_{gm,R}^{eff}(M_{gm}^R(P)\langle j \rangle, M)$, where P is a connected smooth projective variety (over k). Assume that the fibre of g (considered as a rational equivalence class of cycles in the corresponding product of smooth projective varieties) over the generic point of P vanishes. Then g can be factored through an object of $\underline{\text{Chow}}_R^{eff}\langle j + 1 \rangle$.

5. For P and M as in the previous assertion we have $DM_{gm}^R j(M_{gm}^R(P)\langle j \rangle, M) \cong \text{Chow}_j^{R,k(P)}(M)$.

6. For P and M as in the previous assertion and $r \in \mathbb{Z}$ assume that $\dim(P) + j \leq r$ and that the dimension of M (see Definition 2.2.2(2)) is not greater than r also. Then the group $\text{Chow}_j^{R,k(P)}(M)$ is isomorphic to the group of morphisms from $M_{gm}^R(P)\langle j \rangle$ into M in the localization $d_{\leq r} DM_{gm,R}^{eff} / (d_{\leq r-j-1} DM_{gm,R}^{eff}\langle j + 1 \rangle)$ also.

Proof. 1. Certainly, g can be factored through $\text{Cone}(M_{gm}^R(u))\langle j \rangle$. Next, Corollary 2.2.4(4) yields that $\text{Cone}(M_{gm}^R(u))\langle j \rangle \in DM_{gm,R}^{eff} w_{\text{Chow} \leq 0}\langle j + c \rangle$. Hence for $\text{Cone}(M_{gm}^R(u)) = M'\langle c \rangle$ we can take

$$w_{\text{Chow} \geq 0}(\text{Cone}(M_{gm}^R(u))\langle j \rangle) = (w_{\text{Chow} \geq 0} M')\langle j + c \rangle \in \text{Obj } \underline{\text{Chow}}_R^{eff}\langle j + c \rangle$$

(see Proposition 1.2.4(2)). Hence applying part 8 of the proposition cited we conclude the proof.

2. Let $Q = \sqcup Q_i$, where Q_i are the connected components of Q of some dimensions $m_i \leq m$; let N be a retract of $M_{gm}^R(S)$ for some smooth projective S . By the classical theory of Chow motives, q is given by a collection of algebraic cycles of dimensions $m_i - c$ in $Q_i \times S$. Hence there exists an open $U \subset Q$ such that $Q \setminus U$ is everywhere of codimension $\geq c$ in Q and the "restriction" of q onto U vanishes. Thus the previous assertion yields that q factors through some $M_{gm}^R(P)\langle c \rangle$ for a smooth projective P/k of dimension $\leq m - c$.

3. The first part of the assertion is immediate from Proposition 2.1.1 of [Bon16a].

In order to deduce the second part it suffices to note that all motives in the heart of $d_{\leq m-c} DM_{gm,R}^{eff}\langle c \rangle$ are retracts of $M_{gm}^R(P)\langle c \rangle$ for some smooth projective P/k of dimension $\leq m - c$ (see Corollary 2.2.4(1,3)), and apply the Cancellation theorem.

4. The "continuity" of motivic cohomology groups (cf. also Proposition 2.3.2(1) and Lemma 3.4 of [Via11]) yields the existence of an open dense embedding $u : U \rightarrow P$ such that g vanishes (i.e., it is rationally equivalent to zero if considered as an algebraic cycle) over U also. Hence assertion 1 yields the result.

5. Let $\dim P = d$. Note (similarly to the proof of the previous assertion) that $DM_{gm,R}^{eff}(M_{gm}^R(P)\langle j \rangle, M) \cong \text{Chow}_{j+d}^R(M_{gm}^R(P) \otimes M)$. We obtain a natural surjective homomorphism

$$DM_{gm,R}^{eff}(M_{gm}^R(P)\langle j \rangle, M) \cong \text{Chow}_{j+d}^R(M_{gm}^R(P) \otimes M) \rightarrow \text{Chow}_j^{R,k(P)}(M).$$

By Proposition 1.3.1(3), the natural homomorphism $DM_{\text{gm},R}^{\text{eff}}(M_{\text{gm}}^R(P)\langle j \rangle, M) \rightarrow DM_{\text{gm}}^R(M_{\text{gm}}^R(P)\langle j \rangle, M)$ is surjective also. So, we should compare the kernels.

According to the previous assertion, the second of these kernels consists exactly of morphisms that can be factored through $\underline{\text{Chow}}_R^{\text{eff}}\langle j+1 \rangle$. Next, (the rational equivalence class of cycles representing) any morphism of the latter sort vanishes in $\text{Chow}_j^{R,k(P)}(M)$ for simple dimension reasons (cf. Proposition 2.3.2(2) below). It remains to note that any element of $\text{Ker}(DM_{\text{gm},R}^{\text{eff}}(M_{\text{gm}}^R(P)\langle j \rangle, M) \rightarrow \text{Chow}_j^{R,k(P)}(M))$ can be factored through an object of $\underline{\text{Chow}}_R^{\text{eff}}\langle j+1 \rangle$ according to the previous assertion.

6. The chain of arguments used in the proof of the previous assertion (starting from assertion 1) yields the statement in question (along with the corresponding modification of assertion 4) without any difficulty. $\square$

Remark 2.2.7. 1. The proof of (part 4) of the proposition uses an abstract version of the well-known *decomposition of the diagonal* arguments (cf. Proposition 1 of [BlS83]). The "usual" way to construct the factorization in question (see Theorem 3.6 of [Via11] and Lemma 3 of [GoG13]) is to resolve the singularities of $P \setminus U$. Yet it seems difficult to apply this more explicit method if $p > 0$ (at least, for $\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]$ -coefficients). Moreover, our reasoning is somewhat shorter than the one of loc. cit. (given the properties of Chow weight structures that are absolutely necessary for this paper anyway).

2. In the case $R = \mathbb{Q}$ the "in particular" part of Proposition 2.2.6(3) was established in §3 of [Via11] (see Remark 3.11 of *ibid.*). The general case of the assertion is completely new.

3. The idea of studying $DM_{\text{gm}}^{R,j}$ and the formulation of part 5 of the proposition was inspired by Theorem 3.2.2(f) of [KaS15] (where our assertion was established in the case $j = 0$).

2.3 On higher Chow groups and motivic homology over various fields

We start with some simple definitions.

Definition 2.3.1. Let K be a field.

1. K^{perf} will denote the perfect closure of K .
2. For M being an object of $\underline{\text{Chow}}_R^{\text{eff}}$ (or of $DM_{\text{gm},R}^{\text{eff}}$) and $j, l \in \mathbb{Z}$ we define $\text{Chow}_{j,l}^R(M)$ as $DM_{\text{gm}}^R(R(j)[2j+l], M)$; more generally, for an extension K/k we set $\text{Chow}_{j,l}^{R,K}(M) = DM_{\text{gm}}^R(K^{\text{perf}})(R(j)[2j+l], M_{K^{\text{perf}}})$ (when we will use this notation for general (l, M) , we will usually take $j = 0$ in it).

Note that this definition can be naturally extended to DM_{-R}^{eff} .

3. We will say that K is *essentially finitely generated* if it is the perfect closure of a field that is finitely generated over its prime subfield.

5. We call K a *universal domain* if it is algebraically closed and of infinite transcendence degree over its prime subfield.

6. We will say that a field K_0 is a *field of definition* for an object M of $DM_{\text{gm},R}^{\text{eff}}$ (resp. of $K^b(\underline{\text{Chow}}_R)$) if it is equipped with a (fixed) perfect subfield k_0 , an embedding $k_0 \rightarrow k$, and there is a motif $M_0 \in \text{Obj } DM_{\text{gm},R}^{\text{eff}}(k_0)$ (resp. $M_0 \in \text{Obj } K^b(\underline{\text{Chow}}_R(k_0))$) such that M is isomorphic to M_{0k} .

7. We call K a *rational extension* of k if $K \cong k(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ for some $n \geq 0$.
8. We will say that K is a *function field* over k if K is a finite separable extension of a rational extension K' of k (and so, it is the function field of some smooth connected variety V/k); we will call the transcendence degree of K/k the *dimension* of K over k .

Note that fields of definition for M obviously form a category.

Proposition 2.3.2. *Let $j, l \in \mathbb{Z}$, $d, r \geq 0$. Then the following statements are valid.*

1. *Let $N \in \text{Obj } \underline{\text{Chow}}_R$. Then $\text{Chow}_{j,l}^{R,K}(N) \cong DM_{gm}^R(K)(\widehat{N}_K, R(-j)[-2j-l])$ for any perfect field K/k , where $\widehat{N}$ is the Poincare dual of N (in $\underline{\text{Chow}}_R \subset DM_{gm}^R$).*
2. *For any $N \in \text{Obj } \underline{\text{Chow}}_R^{eff}$ and any field K/k we have $\text{Chow}_{j,l}^{R,K}(N\langle r \rangle) = \{0\}$ if $j - r + l < 0$.*
3. *For an object N of $DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$ (or of DM_{-R}^{eff}) we have $N \in DM_{-R}^{eff, t_{hom}^R \leq 0}$ (see Remark 2.1.1) if and only if $\text{Chow}_{0,l}^{R,K}(N) = \{0\}$ for all $l < 0$ and all function fields K/k .*

Moreover, for any $r \geq 0$ these conditions are equivalent to the vanishing of $\text{Chow}_{-r,l+r}^{R,K}(N)$ for all $l < 0$ and all function fields K/k .

4. *Any object of $DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$ and of $K^b(\underline{\text{Chow}}_R)$ possesses an essentially finitely generated field of definition.*

Proof. 1. This is an immediate consequence of Poincare duality for Voevodsky motives; see Theorem 5.23 of [Deg08].

2. Obviously, it suffices to establish the statement for $N = M_{gm}^R(P)$, where P is as in the previous assertion; so we treat this particular case. Next, recall that motivic cohomology of smooth varieties can be computed as the (co)homology of certain (Suslin or Bloch) cycle complexes, see §4.2 of [Voe00a]. Therefore the group in question is a subquotient of a certain group of cycles of K^{perf} -dimension $j - r + l$. The result follows immediately.

3. Easy from Theorem 3.3.1 of [BoD15] (cf. also Corollary 4.18 of [Voe00b]).

4. This fact appears to be well-known; its easy proof can easily be obtained using the *continuity* arguments that were considered in §1.3 of [Bon16b] following [CiD12, §4.3].

□

Now let us prove some facts relating (complexes of) higher Chow groups over various base fields. Our first statement is rather "classical" (cf. Lemma IA.3 of [Blo10] and §3 of [Via11]; one can also apply the more advanced formalism of [CiD15] to prove it), whereas the second one relies on the results of [Bon10b] (and [Bon13]) and appears to be new.

Proposition 2.3.3. *Let $j, l \in \mathbb{Z}$.*

Fix an object (M^i) of $K^b(\underline{\text{Chow}}_R)$; for a field of definition K_0 of (M^i) denote by $G(K_0)$ the zeroth homology of the complex $\text{Chow}_{j,l}^{R,K_0}(M^*)$ (certainly, G is functorial with respect to morphisms of fields of definition for (M^i)).

I. The following statements are valid.

1. *Let $K_0 \subset K'_0$ be fields of definitions for M . Then $G(K'_0)$ is the (filtered) direct limit of $G(K)$ if we take K running through all finitely generated extensions of K_0 inside K'_0 such that the extension $K \cap K_0^{alg}/K_0$ is separable.*

2. Let K_1/k_0^1 and K_2/k_0^2 be fields of definition for M ; let $s : K_1 \rightarrow K_2$ be an embedding of fields such that for the corresponding motives obtained by extending scalars we have $(M_{0K_1}^1)_{K_2} \cong M_{0K_2}^2$ (note that we do not require s to be a morphisms of fields of definition over k). Then s induces a homomorphism $G(K_1) \rightarrow G(K_2)$ that is an isomorphism if $s(K_1) = K_2$, and is injective if K_1 is algebraically closed.

II. Let $R = \mathbb{Q}$.⁷ Then the following conditions are equivalent.

1. $G(K) = 0$ for any function field K/k .
2. $G(K_0) = 0$ for some universal domain of definition for M .
3. $G(K_0) = 0$ for any algebraically closed field of definition for M .
4. $G(K_i) = 0$ for some algebraically closed fields of definition of M such that the transcendence degrees of K_i over the corresponding prime field are not bounded above by any natural number.
5. $G(K_0) = 0$ for any field of definition for M .

III. All the statements above remain valid if we define $G(K)$ as $\text{Chow}_{j,l}^{R,K}(M)$ for a fixed $M \in \text{Obj } DM_{gm}^R$.

Proof. We note (for convenience) that we can pass to the Poincare duals in all of these statements (see Proposition 2.3.2(1)). So, we can express $G(K)$ in terms of motivic cohomology instead of motivic homology. We obviously do not have to track the indices involved.

I. Recall that the motivic cohomology of Chow motives can be (functorially) computed using certain complexes whose terms are expressed in terms of algebraic cycles. This fact easily yields all our assertions except the (very) last one (since any finitely generated extension of a field k is purely inseparable over some function field K/k).

In order to verify the remaining statement we note that for a (Voevodsky) motif N defined over a perfect field L the motivic cohomology of $N_{L'}$ (for a perfect field extension L'/L) can be (functorially in N) expressed as the filtered direct limit of the corresponding cohomology of $N \otimes M_{gm,R,L}(V_a)$ for certain smooth varieties V_a over L . Next, if L is algebraically closed, then the $DM_{gm,L}^R$ -morphism $R \rightarrow M_{gm}^R(V_a)$ possesses a splitting given by any L -point of V_a . Hence the homomorphism in question is injective since it can be presented as the direct limit of a system of (split) injections.

One may also apply ("explicitly") the continuity arguments mentioned in the proof of Proposition 2.3.2(4) in these proofs.

II. The existence of trace maps for higher Chow groups (with respect to finite extensions of not necessarily perfect base fields; cf. Lemma 1.2 of [Via11]) yields the following: if K'_0/K_0 is an algebraic extension and $G(K'_0) = \{0\}$, then $G(K_0) = \{0\}$ also. Along with Proposition 2.3.2(4) and assertion I, this observation easily yields our claim.

III. Note that the motivic (co)homology of any Voevodsky motif can be computed using certain complexes of algebraic cycles. The existence of these

⁷Throughout this paper the $R = \mathbb{Q}$ assumption may be replaced by R being a $\mathbb{Q}$ -algebra. This generalization may be relevant for studying motives similar to those considered in [Wil09].

complexes is immediate from (the R -module analogue of) Theorem 3.1.1 of [Bon09] (note that this result is valid for any p ; this is a consequence of Proposition 5.5.11(4) of [Kel12]). Hence the arguments above carry over to this setting without any difficulty. $\square$

Proposition 2.3.4. *Once again, let $j, l \in \mathbb{Z}$, $(M^i) \in \text{Obj } K^b(\underline{\text{Chow}}_R)$; let K_1 and K_2 be function fields over k . For $r > 0$ assume that there exists a geometric k -valuation of rank r for K_2 such that the corresponding residue field is isomorphic to K_1 . Then there exists a split injection of the complex $\text{Chow}_{j,l}^{R,K_1}(M^*)$ into the complex $\text{Chow}_{j-r,l+r}^{R,K_2}(M^*)$.*

Proof. Certainly we can assume $j = l = 0$ in this statement. Once again, we apply the Poincare duality and obtain (see Proposition 2.3.2(1)) the following: for a complex $(N^i) \in \text{Obj } \underline{\text{Chow}}_R$ we should construct a split injection of the complex $(DM_{gm}^R(N_{K_1^{perf}}^*, R))$ into $(DM_{gm}^R(N_{K_2^{perf}}^*, R(r)[r]))$. Note also that if $\text{Spec } K_b$ (for $i = 1, 2$) are the inverse (filtered) limit of some systems of smooth varieties X_n^b/k and $O \in \text{Obj } \underline{\text{Chow}}_R$, then $(DM_{gm}^R(O_{K_b^{perf}}, R)) \cong \varinjlim DM_{gm}^R(M_{gm}^R(X_n^b) \otimes O, R)$.

Hence the statement would be proved if we had a motivic category $\mathfrak{D} \supset DM_{gm}^R$ that contains certain homotopy limits $\varprojlim M_{gm}^R(X_n^b)$ for $b = 1, 2$ (that can be denoted as $M_{gm}(\text{Spec } K^b)$), is equipped with a bi-additive tensor product bifunctor $DM_{gm}^R \times \mathfrak{D}^R \rightarrow \mathfrak{D}^R$ such that $\mathfrak{D}((\varprojlim M_{gm}^R(X_n^b)) \otimes O, R)$ are functorially isomorphic to $\varinjlim (M_{gm}^R(X_n^b) \otimes O, R)$, and such that there exists a split $\mathfrak{D}^R$ -morphism $\varinjlim (M_{gm}^R(X_n^1))(r)[r] \rightarrow \varinjlim (M_{gm}^R(X_n^2))$.

Luckily, the results of previous papers yield the existence of $\mathfrak{D}$ having all these properties. Indeed, for $R = \mathbb{Z}$ a certain category of this sort was constructed in [Bon10b]. It has suffered from two drawbacks: it only contained DM_{gm}^{eff} instead of DM_{gm} , and the splitting in question was established (see Corollary 4.2.2(2) of *ibid.*) only for k being countable. Yet one can easily "correct" that category so that it would contain DM_{gm}^R , and in §6.4 of [Bon13] it was shown that the desired splitting exists for any perfect k . $\square$

Remark 2.3.5. 1. Since a function field of dimension d is a finite separable extension of $k(t_1, \dots, t_d)$, it is also a residue field for a (rank 1) geometric valuation of $k(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{d+1})$. Thus one may say that it suffices to compute stalks at rational extensions of k only!

2. One can prove the natural analogue of the previous proposition for the complex $\text{Chow}_{j,l}^{R,K_b}(M^*)$ replaced by the group $\text{Chow}_{j,l}^{R,K_b}(N)$, where N is an object of DM_{-R}^{eff} (or of DM_R^{eff} ; to this end it suffices to recall just a little more of the results of [Bon10b]).

Thus one obtains that $N \in DM_{-R}^{eff} t_{hom}^R \leq 0$ if and only if $\text{Chow}_{0,l}^{R,K}(N(1)[1]) = \{0\}$ for all rational fields K/k (only!) and for all $l < 0$.

Possibly, the authors will dedicate a separate note to this observation.

3. One can also verify that $\text{Chow}_{j-r,l+r}^{R,K}(M^*)$ contains (as a retract) the sum of any finite number of $\text{Chow}_{j,l}^{R,k_m}(M^*)$ for k_m being residue fields for (distinct) geometric valuations of K of rank r . Hence the homology groups of $\text{Chow}_{j-r,l+r}^{R,K}(M^*)$ can be quite huge. So, we will not try to calculate them

in general (at least, in the current paper); we will rather be interested in their vanishing.

3 The central results

In this section we prove the central results of this paper.

In §3.1 we introduce the main homology theories of this paper (obtained via composing certain homology considered in the previous section with the weight complex functor) and prove several of their properties.

In §3.2 we relate the Chow-weight homology with the c -effectivity of motives and their weights. A very particular case of this result yields: a cone of a morphism h of Chow motives is c -effective if and only if h induces isomorphisms on Chow groups of dimensions less than c .

In §3.3 we generalize the aforementioned results to obtain equivalent criteria for the vanishing of Chow-weight homology in a certain "range"; we also note that the corresponding "decompositions" of motives can be assumed not to increase their dimension. We demonstrate the utility of our Theorem 3.3.3 by a simple application; we apply it to the study of motivic homology later.

In §3.4 we prove that the properties of motives studied in the previous subsection can also be "detected" through the higher Chow-weight homology. As a consequence, we relate the vanishing of Chow-weight homology of M with that for its higher degree (zero-dimensional) motivic homology (and so, with its t_{hom}^R -connectivity).

3.1 Chow-weight homology: definition and basic properties

Let us define the main homology theories of this paper; see Definition 2.3.1(2) for the notation that we use here.

Definition 3.1.1. 1. We will write $t_R(M)$ for a choice of a weight complex for a motif $M \in \text{Obj } DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$ (or for $M \in \text{Obj } DM_{gm}^R$) with respect to the Chow weight structure for $DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$ (so, it is a $\underline{Chow}_R^{eff}$ -complex; as we have already said, one can assume that t_R is a functor $DM_{gm,R}^{eff} \rightarrow K^b(\underline{Chow}_R^{eff})$).

2. Let $j, l, i \in \mathbb{Z}$; let K be a field extension of k .

For an object M of $DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$ (or of DM_{gm}^R), (M^*) being a choice of $t_R(M)$, we define the abelian group $CWH_{i,K}^j(M)$ (resp. $CWH_{i,K}^{j,l}(M)$) as the i -th homology of the complex $Chow_j^{R,K}(M^*)$ (resp. of $Chow_{j,l}^{R,K}(M^*)$).⁸

Let us prove some properties of $CWH_{*,K}^{**}$.

Proposition 3.1.2. *Let l, i, K be as above, $r, j \geq 0$.*

1. $CWH_{i,K}^{j,l}(-)$ yields a homological functor on $DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$ (that does not depend on any choices).

2. Assume $r \geq j + l$. Then $CWH_{i,K}^{j,l}$ kills $DM_{gm,R}^{eff}\langle r + 1 \rangle$ (and so, induces a well-defined functor $DM_{gm}^R\langle r \rangle \rightarrow Ab$; see Definition 2.2.2(3)).

⁸The reader should pay attention to the modification of the position of indices made in this notation for purely typographical reasons; besides, we omit R in it.

3. Let $N \in DM_{gm, w_{Chow} \geq 0}^{R, j}$. Then for any smooth projective connected variety P/k we have: $DM_{gm}^{R, j}(l^j(M_{gm}^R(P)\langle j \rangle), N) \cong CWH_{0, k(P)}^j(N)$ (note that the latter group is well-defined according to the previous assertion).
4. Let $N \in DM_{gm, R, w_{Chow} \geq -n}^{eff, r}$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then $CWH_{i, K}^{j, l}(N) = \{0\}$ for all $i > n$, $j \leq r - l$ (note that the corresponding $CWH_{i, K}^{j, l}(N)$ are well-defined).
5. Assume $0 \leq m \leq r$. Let N belong to $DM_{gm, R, w_{Chow} \geq -i}^{eff}$ (resp. to $DM_{gm, w_{Chow} \geq -i}^{R, r}$) and assume $CWH_{i, K}^j(N) = \{0\}$ for all $0 \leq j \leq m$ and all function fields K/k . Then for any fixed choice of a (shifted) weight decomposition $w_{Chow \leq -i} N \xrightarrow{g} N \rightarrow w_{Chow \geq 1-i} N$ (see (1)) the morphism $g[i]$ can be factored through an object of $\underline{Chow}_R^{eff} \langle m+1 \rangle$ (resp. through an image of such an object in $DM_{gm}^{R, r}$).
6. If $N \in \text{Obj } DM_{gm, R}^{eff} \cap \text{Obj } DM_{-R}^{eff, t_{hom}^R \leq 0}$ (see Remark 2.1.1) and $i > j + l$ then $CWH_{i, K}^{j, l}(N) = \{0\}$.

Proof. 1. This is just a particular case of Proposition 1.4.2(6).

2. Recall that $DM_{gm, R}^{eff} \langle r \rangle$ is strongly generated by $\text{Obj } \underline{Chow}_R^{eff} \langle r \rangle$ (as a triangulated subcategory of $DM_{gm, R}^{eff}$). Hence the statement follows immediately from Proposition 2.3.2(2).

3. By Proposition 2.2.6(5), $CWH_{0, k(P)}^j(N)$ is isomorphic to the zeroth homology of the complex $DM_{gm}^{R, j}(l^j(M_{gm}^R(P)\langle j \rangle), N^*)$ (for N^* being the terms of a weight complex for N). Hence it remains to apply Corollary 1.4.6(1).

4. We can certainly assume that the weight complex of N is concentrated in degrees $\leq n$ (see Proposition 1.4.2(2)). Next, recall that any object of the heart of $DM_{gm, w_{Chow}}^{R, r}$ is a retract of a one coming from $\underline{Chow}_R^{eff} (\subset DM_{gm, R}^{eff})$. Hence the statement follows from Proposition 2.3.2(2).

5. Obviously, we can assume that $i = 0$.

We have $w_{Chow \leq 0} N \in DM_{gm, R, w_{Chow} = 0}^{eff}$ (resp. $w_{Chow \leq 0} N \in DM_{gm, w_{Chow} = 0}^{R, r}$); so it is a retract of $M_{gm}^R(P)$ (resp. of $l^r(M_{gm}^R(P))$) for some $P \in SmPrVar$.

Hence it suffices to check the following for any $0 \leq j \leq m$ and $P^j \in SmPrVar$: any morphism g_j in the set $DM_{gm, R}^{eff}(M_{gm}^R(P^j)\langle j \rangle, N)$ (resp. in $DM_{gm}^{R, r}(l^r(M_{gm}^R(P^j)\langle j \rangle), N)$) can be factored through $M_{gm}^R(P^{j+1})\langle j+1 \rangle$ (resp. through $l^r(M_{gm}^R(P^{j+1})\langle j+1 \rangle)$) for some $P^{j+1} \in SmPrVar$.

By Corollary 1.4.6(2) applied to l^j (resp. to the localization functor $l_r^j : DM_{gm, R}^{eff, r} \rightarrow DM_{gm, R}^{eff, j}$), to achieve the goal it suffices to verify that the image of g_j in $DM_{gm}^{R, j}$ is 0. It remains to note that this image is an element of $DM_{gm}^{R, j}(l^j(M_{gm}^R(P^j)\langle j \rangle), l^j(N))$ (resp. of $DM_{gm}^{R, j}(l^j(M_{gm}^R(P^j)\langle j \rangle), l_r^j(N))$), whereas the latter group is zero by assertion 3 and by our assumptions on $CWH_{*, k(P_j)}^j(N)$.

6. We certainly have $\text{Obj } DM_{gm, R}^{eff} \cap DM_{-R}^{eff, t_{hom}^R \leq 0} = \text{Obj } DM_{gm, R}^{eff} \cap DM_R^{eff, t_{hom}^R \leq 0}$ (see the end of §2.1).

Now, in [BoD15] the following statement was proved (see Theorem 2.4.3 and Example 2.3.5(1) of *ibid.*): $DM_R^{eff, t_{hom}^R \leq 0}$ is the smallest extension-closed subclass of $\text{Obj } DM_R^{eff}$ that is closed with respect to coproducts and contains $\text{Obj } \underline{Chow}_R^{eff}(a)[a+b]$ for all $a, b \geq 0$.

Next, we note that w_{Chow} can be extended (from $DM_{gm, R}^{eff}$) onto DM_R^{eff} in a way that "respects coproducts" (by the categorical dual to Theorem 2.2.6

of [Bon13]; cf. also Theorem 4.5.2 and §7.1 of [Bon10a]). Hence Chow-weight homology (as well as any other w_{Chow} -pure homology theory whose target is an AB5 abelian category) can be extended to a homological functor $DM_R^{\text{eff}} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}b$ that respects coproducts (here the unboundedness of the "non-geometric" version of w_{Chow} does not cause any problems).

Hence it suffices to verify the vanishing in question for $N \in \text{Obj } \underline{\text{Chow}}_R^{\text{eff}}(a)[a+b]$ (for some $a, b \geq 0$). Thus it remains to apply Proposition 2.3.2(2). $\square$

3.2 Relating Chow-weight homology to c -effectivity and weights of motives

Now we start proving the central results of this paper.

Theorem 3.2.1. *Let $M \in \text{Obj } DM_{\text{gm},R}^{\text{eff}}$, $c > 0$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}$.*

Then the following statements are valid.

1. *$M \in \text{Obj } DM_{\text{gm},R}^{\text{eff}}(c)$ if and only if $\text{CWH}_{i,K}^j(M) = \{0\}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, $0 \leq j < c$, and all function fields K/k .*
2. *More generally, $\text{CWH}_{i,K}^j(M) = \{0\}$ for all $0 \leq j < c$, $n < i$, and all function fields K/k if and only if M is an extension (see §1.1) of an element of $(DM_{\text{gm},R}^{\text{eff}})_{w_{\text{Chow}} \geq -n}$ by an element of $DM_{\text{gm},R}^{\text{eff}}{}_{w_{\text{Chow}} \leq -n-1}(c)$.*
3. *$\text{CWH}_{i,K}^j(M) = \{0\}$ for all $j \geq 0$, $i > n$, and all function fields K/k , if and only if $M \in (DM_{\text{gm},R}^{\text{eff}})_{w_{\text{Chow}} \geq -n}$.*

Proof. 1. If $M \in \text{Obj } DM_{\text{gm},R}^{\text{eff}}(c)$, then $\text{CWH}_{i,K}^j(M) = \{0\}$ for all j, i , and K as in the assertion by Proposition 3.1.2(2).

Conversely, assume that M satisfies the corresponding Chow-weight homology vanishing assumptions. Then it suffices to prove that $l^{c-1}(M) \in DM_{\text{gm},R}^{R, c-1}{}_{w_{\text{Chow}} \geq r}$ for any $r \in \mathbb{Z}$ (since the Chow weight structure for $DM_{\text{gm}}^{R, c-1}$ is bounded). Hence this assertion reduces to the next one.

2. Assume that $l^{c-1}(M)$ belongs to $DM_{\text{gm},R}^{\text{eff}, c-1}{}_{w_{\text{Chow}} \geq -n}$. Then the vanishing of Chow-weight homology groups in question is immediate from part 4 of Proposition 3.1.2.

Conversely, let the Chow-weight homology vanishing assumptions be fulfilled. Certainly, there exists an integer q such that $l^{c-1}(M) \in DM_{\text{gm},R}^{R, c-1}{}_{w_{\text{Chow}} \geq q}$. By Proposition 1.3.1(2), it suffices to verify the following: if $l^{c-1}(M) \in DM_{\text{gm},R}^{R, c-1}{}_{w_{\text{Chow}} \geq t}$ for some $t < -n$, then $l^{c-1}(M)$ also belongs to $DM_{\text{gm},R}^{R, c-1}{}_{w_{\text{Chow}} \geq t+1}$.

Let us take a shifted weight decomposition $w_{\text{Chow} \leq t} l^{c-1}(M) \xrightarrow{g} l^{c-1}(M) \rightarrow w_{\text{Chow} \geq t+1} l^{c-1}(M)$. Proposition 3.1.2(5) yields that $g = 0$. Hence $l^{c-1}(M)$ is a retract of an element of $DM_{\text{gm},R}^{R, c-1}{}_{w_{\text{Chow}} \geq t+1}$; thus it belongs to $DM_{\text{gm},R}^{R, c-1}{}_{w_{\text{Chow}} \geq t+1}$ itself. By Theorem 3.2.5 and Remark 3.2.6(1) of [Sos15], M is an extension of an element of $(DM_{\text{gm},R}^{\text{eff}})_{w_{\text{Chow}} \geq -n}$ by an element of $DM_{\text{gm},R}^{\text{eff}}{}_{w_{\text{Chow}} \leq -n-1}(c)$.

3. If $M \in DM_{\text{gm},R}^{\text{eff}}{}_{w_{\text{Chow}} \geq -n}$ then the previous assertion yields the vanishing of $\text{CWH}_{i,K}^j(M) = \{0\}$ for all $j \geq 0$, $i > n$, and all function fields K/k .

Conversely, it suffices (similarly to the previous argument) to check the following: if $M \in DM_{\text{gm},R}^{\text{eff}}{}_{w_{\text{Chow}} \geq t}$ for some $t < -n$, then $M \in DM_{\text{gm},R}^{\text{eff}}{}_{w_{\text{Chow}} \geq t+1}$. Again, we can fix a shifted weight decomposition $w_{\text{Chow} \leq t} M \xrightarrow{g} M \rightarrow w_{\text{Chow} \geq t+1} M$

and check that $g = 0$. Assume that $w_{Chow \leq t} M[-t]$ is (a Chow motif) of dimension $\leq s$ for some $s \geq 0$. By Proposition 3.1.2(5), our Chow-weight homology assumptions yield that $g[-t]$ can be factored through $\underline{Chow}_R^{eff} \langle s+1 \rangle$. Hence Proposition 2.2.6(2) implies that $g = 0$. $\square$

Remark 3.2.2. We make some simple remarks.

1. In the case $R = \mathbb{Q}$, Proposition 2.3.3(II) implies that instead of calculating the corresponding $CWH_{i,K}^j(M)$ for all function fields K/k it suffices to take K being some fixed universal domain containing k ; cf. Theorem 3.3.3 below.

Actually, it suffices to assume that R is a $\mathbb{Q}$ -algebra here.

2. As a very particular case of the theorem, we obtain the following fact: for a morphism h of effective Chow motives the complex $\text{Cone}(h)$ is c -effective (i.e., it is homotopy equivalent to a cone of a morphism of c -effective Chow motives) if and only if h induces isomorphisms on the corresponding Chow groups of dimension less than c ; cf. Remark 3.3.4 below. Certainly, here one should consider the Chow groups over all function fields over k for a general R ; for $R = \mathbb{Q}$ a single universal domain K/k is sufficient. Another equivalent condition is that " h possesses an inverse modulo cycles supported in codimension c " (see Corollary 3.3.5 and Remark 3.3.6 below for more detail).

We will prove an extension of this equivalence statement in Corollary 3.3.5 below. Even for $R = \mathbb{Q}$ these particular cases of the theorem haven't been stated in the existing literature.

3. The Chow-weight homology groups are rather difficult to calculate (and they tend to be huge, at least, over universal domains; cf. §4.4); still they are somewhat easier to treat than the (ordinary) motivic homology groups. In particular, CWH_*^* can be explicitly computed for any motif belonging to the subcategory of $DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$ strongly generated by $\cup_{j \geq 0} \langle d_{\leq 1} DM_{gm,R}^{eff} \langle j \rangle \rangle$ (cf. Remark 4.4.2(2) below), whereas the 0-dimensional motivic homology is very difficult to compute already for $\mathbb{CP}^2$. We will say more on the comparison of Chow-weight homology with the motivic one in §3.4 below (and especially in Remark 3.4.3(1)).

4. Now we describe (one more) class of motives for which the Chow-weight homology groups are "known better".

Obviously, for a smooth X/k Poincare duality allows to express the motivic cohomology of X (that coincides with the corresponding cohomology of $M_{gm}^R(X)$) in terms of the motivic homology of the dual of $M_{gm}^R(X)$; one can also twist the latter object by $\langle \dim X \rangle$ in order to obtain an effective motif. Now, in the case where X is equidimensional, one obtains the R -motif with compact support $M_{gm}^{c,R}(X)$ this way (see Theorem 5.5.14(3) of [Kel12]). We certainly have $M_{gm}^{c,R}(X) \in DM_{gm,R}^{eff, w_{Chow} \leq 0}$ (this is an easy consequence of Proposition 2.2.1(2); see the beginning of §4.2 below).

This yields (see Corollary 1.4.6(1)) the following: $CWH_0^j(M_{gm}^{c,R}(X)) \cong Chow_j^R(X)$ (for any $j \geq 0$). In particular, our results can be applied to

deducing the so-called decomposition of the diagonal statements and relating them with the properties of (co)homology (see §4.1 below along with [Par94], [Voi14], [BlS83], [GoG12], [GoG13], [Via11], and several other related articles). We will possibly say more on this matter in subsequent papers.

3.3 A generalization (in terms of staircase sets)

To generalize Theorem 3.2.1 we need the following technical definition.

Definition 3.3.1. Let I be a subset of $\mathbb{Z} \times [0, +\infty)$ (see §1.1).

We will call it a *staircase* set if for any $(i, j) \in \mathbb{Z} \times [0, +\infty)$ such that $i' \geq i$ and $0 \leq j' \leq j$ we have $(i', j') \in I$.

For $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ the minimum of $j \in [0, +\infty]$ such that $(i, j) \notin I$ will be denoted by $a_{I,i}$.

Remark 3.3.2. 1. Obviously, $I \subset \mathbb{Z} \times [0, +\infty)$ is a staircase set if and only if it equals the union of the strips $\bigcup_{(i_0, j_0) \in I} I_{i_0, j_0}$, where $I_{i_0, j_0} = [i_0, +\infty) \times [0, j_0]$ (see §1.1).

2. For the convenience of the readers we note that the condition for $M \in \text{Obj } DM_{\text{gm}, R}^{\text{eff}}$ to belong to $\text{Obj } DM_{\text{gm}, R}^{\text{eff}} \langle c \rangle$ corresponds to $I = \mathbb{Z} \times [0, c - 1]$ (via assertion 3 of the following theorem), $(DM_{\text{gm}, R}^{\text{eff}})_{w_{\text{Chow}} \geq -n}$ corresponds to $I = [n + 1, +\infty) \times [0, +\infty)$, and $(DM_{-R}^{\text{eff}})^{t_{\text{hom}} \leq n}$ corresponds to $I = \{(i, j) : i - n > j \geq 0\}$ (see Corollary 3.4.2 below).

Another relevant staircase set is considered in (the proof of) Corollary 3.3.5 below.

Now we prove a generalization of Theorem 3.2.1 and prove in addition that one can "bound dimensions" of the components of the corresponding "decompositions".

Theorem 3.3.3. Let $I \subset \mathbb{Z} \times [0, +\infty)$. Then the following statements are valid.

1. The vanishing of $\text{CWH}_{i, K}^j(M)$ for all function fields K/k and all $(i, j) \in I$ is equivalent to the same vanishing for all field extensions K/k .

2. Let $R = \mathbb{Q}$. Then the vanishing of $\text{CWH}_{i, K}^j(M)$ for all function fields K/k and $(i, j) \in I$ is also equivalent to $\text{CWH}_{i, K}^j(M) = \{0\}$ for all $(i, j) \in I$ and K being some fixed universal domain containing k .

3. Suppose that I is a staircase set. Then the following conditions are equivalent.

A. $\text{CWH}_{i, K}^j(M) = \{0\}$ for all function fields K/k and $(i, j) \in I$.

B. $l^j(M)$ belongs to $DM_{\text{gm}, R}^R \langle j \rangle$ whenever $(i, j) \in I$.

C. For any $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ there exists a choice of $w_{\text{Chow}} \leq -i$ M (see (1)) belonging to $\text{Obj } DM_{\text{gm}, R}^{\text{eff}} \langle a_{I,i} \rangle$.

D. M belongs to the extension-closure of $\bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} (\text{Obj } \text{Chow}_R^{\text{eff}}[-i] \langle a_{I,i} \rangle)$.⁹

E. There exists a choice of a weight complex for M such that its i -th term is $j + 1$ -effective whenever $(i, j) \in I$.

4. For I being a staircase set and $M \in DM_{\text{gm}, R}^{\text{eff}}[a, b]$ (for some $a \leq b \in \mathbb{Z}$) the (equivalent) conditions of the previous assertion are fulfilled if and only if M belongs to the extension-closure of $\bigcup_{-b \leq i \leq -a} (\text{Obj } \text{Chow}^{\text{eff}}[-i] \langle a_{I,i} \rangle)$.

⁹In this theorem we use the convention of Definition 2.2.2(4) in the case $a_{I,i} = +\infty$.

5. Assume that M is of dimension of at most $r \geq 0$ (see Definition 2.2.2(2)) and that I is a staircase set. Then Conditions A and B of assertion 3 are equivalent to the following modifications of Condition C (resp. D): there exists a choice of $w_{\text{Chow} \leq -i} M$ belonging to $\text{Obj}(d_{\leq r-a_{I,i}} DM_{\text{gm},R}^{eff}) \langle a_{I,i} \rangle$ (resp. M belongs to the extension-closure of $\cup_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} (\text{Obj } d_{\leq r-a_{I,i}} \underline{\text{Chow}}_R^{eff}[-i] \langle a_{I,i} \rangle)$). Moreover, a similar modification can also be made in assertion 4.

Proof. Assertions 1 and 2 follow from Proposition 2.3.3 immediately.

3,4. We apply Remark 3.3.2(1). According to Theorem 3.2.1(2) (cf. also its proof), the vanishing of $CWH_i^{j,K}(M)$ for all function fields K/k and $(i,j) \in I_{(i_0,j_0)}$ is equivalent to $l^{j_0}(M) \in DM_{\text{gm},R}^{j_0} w_{\text{Chow} \geq -i_0+1}$. The combination of these equivalences for all $(i_0, j_0) \in I$ yields the equivalence of Conditions A and B in assertion 3.

Next, Condition B implies Condition C for a fixed $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ if $a_{I,i} < +\infty$ according to Theorem 3.2.1(2) (since $(i, a_{I,i} - 1) \in I$; cf. also Proposition 3.3.1 of [Sos15]). If $a_{I,i} = +\infty$ then one should apply Theorem 3.2.1(3) instead.

Now assume that M satisfies Condition C and belongs to $DM_{\text{gm},R}^{eff}[a,b]$ for some $a \leq b \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then M is also an object of $DM_{\text{gm},R}^{eff} \langle a_{I,b} \rangle$ (see Remark 2.2.5(2)). Thus we can modify the choices of $w_{\text{Chow} \leq -i} M$ coming from Condition C (for $-i \notin [a, b-1]$) by setting $w_{\text{Chow} \leq -i} M = 0$ for $-i < a$ and $w_{\text{Chow} \leq -i} M = M$ for $-i \geq b$. Then the corresponding triangles (2) yield that (for the M^i coming from this choice of a Chow-weight Postnikov tower for M) we have $M^i \in DM_{\text{gm},R}^{eff} w_{\text{Chow}=0} \langle a_{I,i} \rangle$ (see Remark 2.2.5(1)), and we obtain Condition E. Next, Proposition 1.4.2(4) yields that M belongs to the extension-closure of $\cup_{-b \leq i \leq -a} \underline{\text{Chow}}_R^{eff}[-i] \langle a_{I,i} \rangle$ (i.e., we have proved the corresponding implication from assertion 4); we certainly also obtain Condition D.

Finally, assume that $t_R(M) = (M^i)$ for M^i as in Condition E (i.e., $M^i \in \text{Obj } \underline{\text{Chow}}_R^{eff} \langle a_{I,i} \rangle$). Since (for any (i,j)) the group $CWH_i^{j,K}(M)$ is a subquotient of $\text{Chow}_j^{R,K}(M^i)$, and this group vanishes whenever $(i,j) \in I$ (by Proposition 2.3.2(2)), we obtain Condition A.

This finishes the proof.

5. First we note that $\text{Obj } DM_{\text{gm},R}^{eff} \langle a_{I,i} \rangle \cap \text{Obj } d_{\leq r} DM_{\text{gm},R}^{eff} = \text{Obj}(d_{\leq r-a_{I,i}} DM_{\text{gm},R}^{eff}) \langle a_{I,i} \rangle$ and $\text{Obj } \underline{\text{Chow}}_R^{eff} \langle a_{I,i} \rangle \cap \text{Obj } d_{\leq r} DM_{\text{gm},R}^{eff} = \text{Obj } \underline{\text{Chow}}_R^{eff} \langle a_{I,i} \rangle$ according to Proposition 2.2.6(3) (certainly, this statement implies in particular that all these intersections are zero if $a_{I,i} = +\infty$).

Thus it suffices to verify that in the equivalences given by assertions 3 and 4 for M one may replace the classes $\text{Obj } DM_{\text{gm},R}^{eff} \langle a_{I,i} \rangle$ and $\text{Obj } \underline{\text{Chow}}_R^{eff}[-i] \langle a_{I,i} \rangle$ by their intersections with $\text{Obj } d_{\leq r} DM_{\text{gm},R}^{eff}$.

As can be easily seen from the proof of these two assertions, to establish the latter result it suffices to verify the corresponding versions of Theorem 3.2.1(2,3). The latter can be easily achieved via replacing the usage of Proposition 2.2.6(5) in their proofs (thus actually the corresponding modification should be made for Proposition 3.1.2(5)) by part 6 of this proposition. $\square$

Remark 3.3.4. The reader can easily check that everywhere in the proofs of Theorems 3.2.1 and 3.3.3 (and of the prerequisites to them) we could have replaced $DM_{\text{gm},R}^{eff}$ by $K^b(\underline{\text{Chow}}_R^{eff})$ (certainly, then we would have to replace $DM_{\text{gm}}^{R,j}$ by the localization $K^b(\underline{\text{Chow}}_R^{eff})/(K^b(\underline{\text{Chow}}_R^{eff}) \langle j+1 \rangle)$, whereas the

Chow weight structure for $K^b(\underline{\text{Chow}}_R^{eff})$ is just the stupid weight structure mentioned in Remark 1.2.3(1)). The corresponding statements may be said to be more general than their $DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$ -versions since there can exist objects of $K^b(\underline{\text{Chow}}_R^{eff})$ that cannot be presented as weight complexes of motives. Besides, these results are easier to understand for the readers that are not well-acquainted with Voevodsky motives. Their disadvantage is that they hardly can be used for controlling "substantially mixed" motivic phenomena; this includes motivic homology (cf. Corollary 3.4.2 below).

We will apply the $K^b(\underline{\text{Chow}}_R^{eff})$ -version of Theorem 3.3.3 to complexes of length 1. Note that we could have considered these complexes as objects of $DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$ instead (see Remark 1.4.3(1)); yet using $K^b(\underline{\text{Chow}}_R^{eff})$ makes our argument somewhat "more elementary".

Corollary 3.3.5. *Let $h : N \rightarrow M$ be a morphism in $\underline{\text{Chow}}_R^{eff}$, $0 \leq c_1 \leq c_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then the following statements are equivalent.*

1. $\text{Chow}_j^{R,K}(h)$ is a bijection for $j \in [0, c_1 - 1]$ and is a surjection for $j \in [c_1, c_2 - 1]$ for all function fields K/k .
2. The complex $N \rightarrow M$ is homotopy equivalent (i.e., $K^b(\underline{\text{Chow}}_R^{eff})$ -isomorphic) to a complex $N' \langle c_1 \rangle \rightarrow M' \langle c_2 \rangle$ for some $N', M' \in \text{Obj } \underline{\text{Chow}}_R^{eff}$.
3. There exists $h' \in \underline{\text{Chow}}_R^{eff}(M, N)$ such that the morphism $\text{id}_M - h \circ h'$ factors through $\underline{\text{Chow}}_R^{eff} \langle c_2 \rangle$, and $\text{id}_N - h' \circ h$ factors through $\underline{\text{Chow}}_R^{eff} \langle c_1 \rangle$.

Proof. (1) $\iff$ (2). We take $C = \text{Cone } h \in \text{Obj } K^b(\underline{\text{Chow}}_R^{eff})$ (or in $DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$; we put N in degree -1 and put M in degree 0), and consider the index set $I = [-1, +\infty) \times [0, c_1 - 1] \cup [0, +\infty) \times [c_1, c_2 - 1]$ (see §1.1).

We immediately obtain the equivalence of our condition 1 to the vanishing of $\text{CWH}_{i,K}^j(C)$ for $i \in I$. Combining the equivalence of Conditions A and D in Theorem 3.3.3(3) with Remark 1.3.2(2) (see also Remark 3.3.4), we obtain the result.

(2) $\implies$ (3). We have $l^{c_2-1}(C) \cong l^{c_2-1}(N' \langle c_1 \rangle [1])$. Next, this isomorphism certainly gives a similar isomorphism in the category $K^b(\underline{Hw}_{\text{Chow}, DM_{gm}^R, c_2-1})$. So, C (considered as a $\underline{Hw}_{\text{Chow}, DM_{gm}^R, c_2-1}$ -complex) is homotopy equivalent to $N' \langle c_1 \rangle [1]$; denote the corresponding morphisms $C \rightarrow N' \langle c_1 \rangle [1] \rightarrow C$ by f and g , respectively. Since id_C is $\underline{Hw}_{\text{Chow}, DM_{gm}^R, c_2-1}$ -homotopic to $g \circ f$, there exists $h'' \in \underline{Hw}_{\text{Chow}, DM_{gm}^R, c_2-1}(M, N)$ such that $\text{id}_N - g \circ f = h'' \circ h$ and $h \circ h'' = \text{id}_M$. Lifting h'' to $h' \in \underline{\text{Chow}}_R^{eff}(M, N)$ (see Proposition 1.3.1(3)), we obtain the desired implication.

(3) $\implies$ (1). Arguing as above, we see that in $K^b(\underline{Hw}_{\text{Chow}, DM_{gm}^R, c_2-1})$ the morphism id_C factors through an object of $\underline{\text{Chow}}_R^{eff} \langle c_1 \rangle [1]$. The desired Chow-weight homology vanishing conditions follow immediately (cf. the proof of Theorem 3.2.1(2)). □

Remark 3.3.6. 1. If $M = M_{gm}^R(P)$ and $N = M_{gm}^R(Q)$ for some $P, Q \in \text{SmPrVar}$, then condition 3 of the corollary can be easily translated into the following assumption: $\text{id}_M - h \circ h'$ is rationally equivalent to a cycle supported on $P' \times P$, and $\text{id}_N - h' \circ h$ is rationally equivalent to a cycle supported on $Q' \times Q$, where $P' \subset P$ and $Q' \subset Q$ are some closed subvarieties of codimensions c_2 and c_1 , respectively (see Proposition 2.2.6(1,2) and its proof).

2. Assume $C \in d_{\leq m} K^b(\underline{\text{Chow}}_R^{eff})$ (for some $m \geq 0$; this is certainly the case if N and M are of dimension at most m). Then $\text{CWH}_{i,K}^j(C) = \{0\}$ for j greater than m (and all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$). Thus if c_2 is greater than m then our result yields that h splits; if $c_1 > m$ then h is an isomorphism. The first of these observations generalizes Theorem 3.18 of [Via11] (where the case $R = \mathbb{Q}$ was considered).

3. It is easily seen that for $R = \mathbb{Q}$ we can take c_2 being arbitrarily large whenever h corresponds to a surjective morphism of smooth projective varieties (though it probably makes sense to consider surjective morphisms of arbitrary varieties also).

Furthermore, one may tensor examples to our Corollary to obtain non-obvious statements on Chow groups of the corresponding motives. This is quite remarkable since (certainly) there cannot exist any Künneth-type formulas for Chow-weight homology.

3.4 Criteria in terms of higher Chow-weight homology; an application to motivic homology

Now we invoke Proposition 2.3.4.

Proposition 3.4.1. *Let $I \subset \mathbb{Z} \times [0, +\infty)$ and $M \in \text{Obj } DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$ be fixed.*

Consider the following conditions on M .

1. *For some function $f_M : I \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ we have $\text{CWH}_{i,K}^{j-f_M(i,j), f_M(i,j)}(M) = \{0\}$ for all $(i, j) \in I$ and all function fields K/k .*
2. *$\text{CWH}_{i,K}^j(M) = \{0\}$ for all $(i, j) \in I$ and all function fields K/k .*
3. *For all rational extensions K/k and $(i, j) \in I$ we have $\text{CWH}_{i,K}^{j-1, 1}(M) = \{0\}$.*
4. *$\text{CWH}_{i,K}^{0,j}(M) = \{0\}$ for all $(i, j) \in I$ and all function fields K/k .*
5. *$\text{CWH}_{i,K}^{a, j-a}(M) = \{0\}$ for all $(i, j) \in I$, $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, and all field extensions K/k .*

Then the following statements are valid.

1. *Condition 5 implies conditions 4 and 3, either of the latter two conditions implies condition 2, whereas the first two conditions are equivalent.*
2. *Let I be a staircase set (in the sense of Definition 3.3.1). Then our conditions 1–5 are equivalent.*
3. *Let $R = \mathbb{Q}$. Then our conditions are also equivalent to the vanishing of $\text{CWH}_{i,K}^j(M)$ for K being a fixed universal domain containing k and all $(i, j) \in I$.*

Proof. 1. Certainly, condition 5 is the strongest of the five, whereas condition 1 follows from condition 2 and 4. The remaining implications are given by Proposition 2.3.4 (see also Remark 2.3.5(1)).

2. Since the first two conditions are equivalent, it suffices to verify that condition 2 implies condition 5.

By Theorem 3.3.3(3), M satisfies Condition D of this theorem. Hence Proposition 3.1.2(4) yields the implication in question (cf. the proof of Theorem 3.3.3(3), $D \implies A$).

3. Similarly to the setting of Theorem 3.3.3(2), it suffices to combine assertion 2 with Proposition 2.3.3. $\square$

Now we describe an interesting particular case of the proposition.

Corollary 3.4.2. *Let $M \in \text{Obj } DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$. Then the following conditions are equivalent.*

1. $M \in DM_{-R}^{eff t_{hom}^R \leq 0}$ ($= DM_R^{eff t_{hom}^R \leq 0}$).
2. $\text{Chow}_{0,l}^{R,K}(M) = \{0\}$ for all $l < 0$ and all function fields K/k .
3. Conditions 1–5 of the previous proposition for $I = \{(i, j) : i > j \geq 0\}$ are fulfilled (note that it suffices to verify only one of these conditions).
4. M belongs to the extension-closure E of $(\cup_{a \geq 0} DM_{gm,R}^{eff w_{Chow}=a}(a)) \cup DM_{gm}^{eff w_{Chow} \geq 0}$ (in $\text{Obj } DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$).

Proof. The first condition is equivalent to the second one by Proposition 2.3.2(3). (Any of) these two conditions also imply the third condition (i.e., all of the equivalent conditions from Proposition 3.4.1) by Proposition 3.1.2(6). Next, our condition 2 is the corresponding case of condition 2 of Proposition 3.4.1. Hence it yields our condition 4 by Theorem 3.3.3(3) (see Condition D in that theorem; note that $a_{I,i}$ for $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ equals $\max(i, 0)$ in this case).

Finally, our assumption 4 implies assumption 1 since for any $a \geq 0$ the classes $DM_{gm,R}^{eff w_{Chow}=a}(a)$ and $DM_{gm,R}^{eff w_{Chow}=a}$ lie in $DM_{-R}^{eff t_{hom}^R \leq 0}$ (see the end of §2.1). $\square$

Remark 3.4.3. 1. Now consider the (Chow-) weight spectral sequences $T(K)$ converging to the (zero-dimensional) motivic homology of M over K : $E_1^{pq}(T(K)) = \text{Chow}_{0,-q}^{R,K}(M^p) \implies \text{Chow}_{0,-p-q}^{R,K}(M)$ (where $t_R(M) = (M^p)$). We certainly have $E_2^{pq}(T(K)) = \text{CWH}_{p,K}^{0,-q}(M)$. So (for any staircase set I) the equivalent conditions of Theorem 3.3.3(3) can be reformulated in terms of the vanishing of the corresponding E_2 -terms of $T(K)$ (for K running through function fields over k). In particular (by Corollary 3.4.2) the higher motivic homology of M (over any extension of k) vanishes whenever all the corresponding $E_2^*(T(K))$ do. This is quite non-trivial since $T(K)$ do not have to degenerate at E_2 !

Hence one may say that the usual motivic homology groups are somewhat "crude mixes" of the Chow-weight ones (via Chow-weight spectral sequences). Indeed, in contrast to the latter groups the motivic homology ones do not "detect" the c -effectivity and weights of motives (i.e., their vanishing in higher degrees does not yield any information of this sort).

2. Moreover, $T(K)$ yield an alternative way of proving that condition 3 of our corollary implies condition 1.

3. For an (effective) Chow motif N and $c \geq 0$ our corollary easily yields the following equivalence: $N \in DM_{-R}^{eff t_{hom}^R \leq -c}$ if and only if N is c -effective. For $R = \mathbb{Q}$ one can also prove this statement by combining Proposition 2.3.4 with Lemma 3.9 of [Via11].

4. Certainly, we could have (slightly) improved condition 4 of our corollary by replacing the usage of Condition D in Theorem 3.3.3(3) by part 4 of this statement in the proof.

4 Supplements and applications

In this section we deduce some more implications from Theorems 3.2.1 and 3.3.3.

In §4.1 we relate the equivalent conditions of Theorem 3.3.3(3) to the properties of the homology $H_*(M)$. The fact that the "motivic effectivity" conditions imply the corresponding effectivity of the factors of the weight filtration on $H_*(M)$ is immediate from the properties of weight filtrations and weight spectral sequences. We also prove that a pair of (more or less) "standard" motivic conjectures implies the converse implication for singular homology (of motives with rational coefficients). Furthermore, in the case where k is finite the effectivity conditions for motives are easily seen to be closely related to numbers of points of varieties over k (modulo powers of $q = \#k$).

In §4.2 we dualize Theorem 3.2.1; this allows to bound the dimensions of motives and also their weights (from above) via calculating their *Chow-weight cohomology*. We also note that to verify the vanishing of Chow-weight homology of M (in higher degrees) over arbitrary extensions of k it suffices to compute these groups over (rational) extensions of k of bounded transcendence degrees (only).

In §4.3 we study in detail the question when the higher $\mathbb{Q}$ -linear Chow-weight homology of an "integral" motif M vanishes (using the results of [Sos15]). In particular, we prove that if the Chow-weight homology (or motivic homology; see Corollary 4.3.6(II)) groups of M are torsion in higher degrees then their exponents are finite.

In §4.4 we consider ($\mathbb{Q}$ -linear) motives whose Chow-weight homology groups (in a "staircase range" I) are finite dimensional (over $\mathbb{Q}$). We obtain a generalization of Theorem 3.3.3 in the case where $R = \mathbb{Q}$ and k is a universal domain; one may say that a motif M satisfies these finite dimensionality conditions if and only if it satisfies the corresponding "weight-effectivity" conditions "up to Tate motives". We also define cycle classes for Chow-weight homology and relate them to this question.

In §4.5 we make some more remarks on our main results. In particular, we propose (briefly) a "sheaf-theoretic" approach to our results, and discuss their possible extensions to motives over a base and to certain cobordism motives.

4.1 On the detection of c -effectivity and weights by (singular) homology and cohomology

Now we relate our effectivity conditions on motives to the properties of Chow-weight filtrations and spectral sequences $T_{w_{Chow}}(H, M)$.

Proposition 4.1.1. *Let $H : DM_{gm,R}^{eff} \rightarrow \underline{A}$ be a homological functor, $M \in \text{Obj } DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$, and assume that M satisfies the equivalent conditions of Theorem 3.3.3(3) (for some staircase set I).*

Then for any $p, q \in \mathbb{Z}$ both $E_2^{pq} T_{w_{Chow}}(H, M)$ and the quotient object $(W_{-p} H_{p+q})(M) / (W_{-p-1} H_{p+q})(M)$ are certain subquotients of $H_q(M_{gm}^R(P) \langle a_{I,p} \rangle)$ for some $P \in \text{SmPrVar}$ whenever $a_{I,p} < +\infty$; these two objects vanish if $a_{I,p} = +\infty$.

Moreover, if M is of dimension at most $r \in \mathbb{Z}$ then we can assume here that $\dim P \leq r - a_{I,p}$.

Proof. According to Theorem 3.3.3(3), we may assume that the p th term M^p of $t(M)$ belongs to $\text{Obj } \underline{\text{Chow}}_R^{\text{eff}} \langle a_{I,p} \rangle$ for the first part of the statement and to $\text{Obj}(d_{\leq r-a_{I,p}} \underline{\text{Chow}}_R^{\text{eff}}) \langle a_{I,p} \rangle$ for its "moreover" part (recall that this means $M^p = 0$ if $a_{I,p} = +\infty$). Hence the statement follows immediately from Proposition 1.4.5 (since effective Chow motives are retracts of motives of smooth projective varieties, and we can certainly bound the dimensions of the latter). $\square$

Remark 4.1.2. 1. Thus the study of the weight filtration on $H_*(M)$ for an arbitrary H can yield the non-vanishing of certain Chow-weight and motivic homology groups (see Corollary 3.4.2 for the latter); cf. Proposition 4.1.3 below. This is quite remarkable since the corresponding cycle class maps (in particular, for H being singular or étale homology) are very far from being surjective (in most cases).

2. Certainly, here one may consider cohomology instead of homology; recall (see [Bon10a, §2.4]) that the corresponding weight spectral sequence has the form $E_1^{pq}T = H^q(M^{-p}) \implies H^{p+q}(M)$. One can also replace homology by cohomology in Proposition 4.1.3 below.
3. Now assume that k is finite and $M = M_{gm}^{c,\mathbb{Q}}(X)$ for a (possibly, singular) variety X/k . Then étale cohomology of M (and so also of M^i) is certainly related to the study of the number of rational points $\#X(k)$ modulo powers of $q = \#k$ (and in particular, to $X(k)$ being non-empty). So one can deduce interesting congruences on $\#X(k)$ knowing the vanishing of certain Chow-weight homology (say) of $M' = \text{Cone}(M \rightarrow \mathbb{Q})$.

Now, in [Esn03] a result of this sort was obtained for X being smooth projective (and for $\text{Chow}_0^{\mathbb{Z},K} = \mathbb{Z}$); in this simple setting it certainly suffices to consider "ordinary" Chow groups instead of Chow-weight homology.

However (as demonstrated by J. Kollár's example in [BLÉ08, §3.3]) the situation becomes more complicated if X is allowed to be singular. So we suggest looking at the Chow-weight homology of M (or M') in this case.

One certainly can also consider higher Chow-weight homology for this purpose; see Proposition 3.4.1. Note that these homology groups are the E_2 -terms of Chow-weight spectral sequences that converge to the motivic homology of M , i.e., to the higher Chow groups of X (see [Kel12, Proposition 5.5.11(1)]). Moreover, the conjectures of Beilinson and Parshin (see [Kah05, Conjectures 50,51]) predicts that $DM_{gm,\mathbb{Q}}^{\text{eff}}$ is semi-simple (for a finite k); thus it should be sufficient to look at the Chow-weight filtration on the higher Chow groups of X (and this filtration should split canonically).

4. Certainly, for any H and M the object $(W_{-p}H_{p+q})(M)/(W_{-p-1}H_{p+q})(M)$ is a subquotient of $E_2^{pq}T_{w_{\text{Chow}}}(H, M)$, and we have an isomorphism if the spectral sequence T degenerates at E_2 .

Now, the latter condition is fulfilled if H_* is the singular or étale (co)homology with $\mathbb{Q}$ -linear coefficients (see Remark 2.4.3 of [Bon10a]). Moreover, in this case these E_2 -terms can be functorially expressed in terms of Deligne's weights on $H_*(M)$. In our convention (for numbering homology) the object $H_q(M_{gm}^R(P))$, where $q \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $P \in \text{SmPrVar}$, for these two homology theories is pure of Deligne's weight q ; hence $E_i^{pq}T_{w_{\text{Chow}}}(H, M)$ is of Deligne's weight q also for any $i > 0$.

Moreover, one easily defines a reasonable notion of c -effectivity for these two "types" of H_* for any non-negative integer c that would be suitable for our purposes. Since homology is dual to cohomology, we will call a (pure or mixed) Hodge structure V with rational coefficients 0-effective and write $V \in MHS_{eff}^0$ whenever its dual is effective in the usual sense.¹⁰ Respectively, V is c -effective whenever the Hodge numbers $V^{p,q}$ vanish unless $p + c \leq 0$ and $q + c \leq 0$; then we will write $V \in MHS_{eff}^c$.

Now we will study the question whether the corresponding effectivity restriction on $H_*(M)$ is equivalent to the conditions of Theorem 3.3.3(3). For $R = \mathbb{Q}$ and under certain (rather heavy) restrictions on M one can obtain a statement of this sort for H being étale homology; see the proof of [BoL16, Proposition 4.2.3(4)] for a closely related argument. Here we will describe another statement in this direction.

Proposition 4.1.3. *Let $k \subset \mathbb{C}$ and denote by $H : DM_{gm, \mathbb{Q}}^{eff} \rightarrow MHS_{eff}^0$ the singular homology functor with values in the category of mixed Hodge structures (with rational coefficients).*

Assume that the following conjectures hold.

A. The Hodge conjecture.

B. Any morphism of Chow motives (over $\mathbb{C}$) that induces an isomorphism on their singular homology is an isomorphism.

Assume also that for some staircase set I and $M \in \text{Obj } DM_{gm, \mathbb{Q}}^{eff}$ the Hodge structure $(W_{-i}H_{i+q})(M)/(W_{-i-1}H_{i+q})(M) \in MHS_{eff}^{j+1}$ for all $(i, j) \in I$ and $q \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then the motif M satisfies the (equivalent) conditions of Theorem 3.3.3(3).

Proof. By the virtue of this theorem, it suffices to verify that Condition D in it is fulfilled. So we fix certain $(i, j) \in I$.

We note that MHS_{eff}^{j+1} forms a Serre subcategory of the category MHS_{eff}^0 (of 0-effective mixed Hodge structures). Hence H yields a homological functor $H^{(j)}$ from $DM_{gm}^{\mathbb{Q}, j}$ to the Serre localization $MHS_{eff}^{0/j}$ of the category MHS_{eff}^0 by MHS_{eff}^{j+1} .

Now we argue similarly to the proof of [Bon09, Proposition 7.4.2]. We choose the smallest $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $l^j(M) \in DM_{gm, \mathbb{Q}}^{eff, j, w_{Chow} \geq a}$. We should check that $a > -i$.

Now we assume that the converse holds and choose a Chow-weight complex (M_j^*) for $l^j(M)$ such that $M_j^b = 0$ for all $b > -a$. Note also that the weight-exactness of $l^j : DM_{gm, \mathbb{Q}}^{eff} \rightarrow DM_{gm}^{\mathbb{Q}, j}$ allows us to assume that $M_j^{-a-1} = l^j(M^{-a-1})$ for some $M^{-a-1} \in \text{Obj } \underline{Chow}_R^{eff}$, M_j^{-a} is a retract of $l^j(M^{-a})$ for some $M^{-a} \in \text{Obj } \underline{Chow}_R^{eff}$, and the boundary morphism d_j^{-a-1} is "compatible" with some morphism $d : M^{-a-1} \rightarrow M^{-a}$.

Then our assumptions on $H^*(M)$ yield that $H_q^{(j)}(M_j^{-a-1})$ surjects $H_q^{(j)}(M_j^{-a})$ for all $q \in \mathbb{Z}$. To conclude the proof (and obtain a contradiction) we should verify that d_j^{-a-1} splits.

Now, $H^{(j)}$ certainly factors through the Serre subcategory of $MHS_{eff}^{0/j}$ generated by (the images of) graded polarizable 0-effective Hodge structures.¹¹

¹⁰0-effectivity for pure or mixed $\mathbb{Q}_l$ -Galois representations can certainly be defined similarly.

¹¹Actually, it suffices to consider pure Hodge structures in these semi-simplicity arguments.

Since this subcategory is semi-simple, the surjective morphisms $H_q^{(j)}(M_j^{-a-1}) \rightarrow H_q^{(j)}(M_j^{-a})$ split for all $q \in \mathbb{Z}$. Moreover, the Hodge conjecture allows us to "lift" this splitting to a morphism $d' : M^{-a} \rightarrow M^{-a-1}$. Applying our assumption B we obtain that the corresponding image of d' in $DM_{gm}^{\mathbb{Q},j}(M_j^{-a}, M_j^{-a-1})$ splits d_j^{-a-1} . $\square$

Remark 4.1.4. Certainly, our assumption B is a particular case of the famous conservativity conjecture (that predicts the following: if $H_*(M) = 0$ for H_* being étale or singular (co)homology and $M \in \text{Obj } DM_{gm,\mathbb{Q}}^{eff}$, then $M = 0$).

Corollary 4.1.5. *Assume that k is of characteristic 0, assumptions A and B of Proposition 4.1.3 are fulfilled, and for $M, N \in \text{Obj } DM_{-Q}^{eff}$ we have $M \otimes N \in DM_{-Q}^{eff,t_{hom}^{\mathbb{Q}} \leq -1}$. Then either M or N belongs to $DM_{-Q}^{eff,t_{hom}^{\mathbb{Q}} \leq -1}$ also.*

Proof. We can assume that $k \subset \mathbb{C}$ (since A and B are defined over some countable subfield k' of k , and the base field change functor yields a t -exact functor between the corresponding motivic categories). Recall now that ("total") singular homology is a tensor exact functor. Thus by the virtue of Proposition 4.1.3 it suffices to verify the natural analogue of this statement for the derived category of (mixed) Hodge structures; the latter is easy. $\square$

Remark 4.1.6. 1. In this argument one can certainly replace singular homology by any other homology theory satisfying similar properties. A natural candidate here is the so-called mixed motivic homology corresponding to the conjectural motivic t -structure on $DM_{gm,\mathbb{Q}}^{eff} \subset DM_{gm}^{\mathbb{Q}}$. One can easily see that the "standard" expectations on this functor (see §5.10A in [Bei87], [Bon15a, Definition 3.1.1(4) and Proposition 4.1.1], and [Han99]) imply that the conclusion of our proposition follows from them (for k being a field of arbitrary characteristic).

2. Certainly, no analogue of this proposition holds for motives with $\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]$ -coefficients. This probably means that the proof in the case $R = \mathbb{Q}$ cannot be "too easy" (especially if one does not assume any hard conjectures).

4.2 Chow-weight cohomology and the dimension of motives

Now we dualize (parts 1 and 3 of) Theorem 3.2.1 along with some other properties of Chow-weight homology.

To this end we note that Proposition 2.2.1(1) yields the following: the Poincare duality for DM_{gm}^R "respects" w_{Chow} , i.e., the image under the duality functor of $DM_{gm}^R w_{Chow} \leq 0$ is $DM_{gm}^R w_{Chow} \geq 0$ (and also vice versa). Moreover, the categorical duality (cf. Proposition 1.2.4) essentially respects weight complexes (at least, for motives; this is explained in detail in Remark 1.5.9(1) of [Bon10a]). Thus one easily obtains the following results.

Proposition 4.2.1. *For $M \in \text{Obj } DM_{gm}^R$, $j, l, i \in \mathbb{Z}$, (M^*) being a choice of a weight complex for M , and a field extension K/k we define $CWC_{j,l}^{i,K}(M)$ (resp. $CWC_j^{i,K}(M)$) as the i th homology of the complex $DM_{gm,K^{perf}}^R(M^*, R(j)[2j-l])$ (resp. of $DM_{gm,K^{perf}}^R(M^*, R(j)[2j])$).*

I. The following properties of these cohomology theories are valid.

1. $\mathrm{CWC}_j^{i,K}$ yields a cohomological functor on DM_{gm}^R .
2. $\mathrm{CWC}_j^{i,K}$ vanishes on $d_{\leq n}DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$ if $j - i > n$.

II. Assume that $M \in \mathrm{Obj} d_{\leq n}DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$ for some $n \geq 0$.
Then the following conditions are equivalent.

1. M is also an object of $d_{\leq n-s}DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$ for some $s \in [1, n]$.
2. $\mathrm{CWC}_j^{i,K}(M) = \{0\}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, $j \in [n - s + 1, n]$, and all function fields K/k .
3. $\mathrm{CWC}_{j+1,1}^{i,K}(M) = \{0\}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, $j \in [n - s + 1, n]$, and all rational extensions K/k .
4. $\mathrm{CWC}_{j+r,r}^{i,K}(M) = \{0\}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, $j \in [n - s + 1, n]$, $r \in \mathbb{Z}$, and all field extensions K/k .

III. For M as above and an integer q also the following statements are equivalent.

1. $M \in DM_{gm,R}^{eff w_{Chow} \leq q}$.
2. $\mathrm{CWC}_j^{i,K}(M) = \{0\}$ for all $i > q$, $j \in [1, n]$, and all function fields K/k .
3. $\mathrm{CWC}_{j+1,1}^{i,K}(M) = \{0\}$ for all $i > q$, $j \in [1, n]$, and all rational extensions K/k .
4. $\mathrm{CWC}_{j+r,r}^{i,K}(M) = \{0\}$ for all $i > q$, $j \in [1, n]$, $r \in \mathbb{Z}$, and all field extensions K/k .

IV. Now let $R = \mathbb{Q}$. Then it suffices to verify any of the assertions in parts II and III of the proposition for K being any (fixed) universal domain containing k .

Proof. We recall that the Poincare dual of $d_{\leq n}DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$ is $d_{\leq n}DM_{gm,R}^{eff} \langle -n \rangle$, and that the dual to $\mathrm{Obj} d_{\leq n-s}DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$ can (also) be described as $\mathrm{Obj} d_{\leq n}DM_{gm,R}^{eff} \langle s-n \rangle \cap \mathrm{Obj} d_{\leq n}DM_{gm,R}^{eff} \langle -n \rangle$ (see Proposition 2.2.6(3)). Along with the observations made prior to this proposition, this easily reduces our assertions to their duals that were proved in the previous section. $\square$

Remark 4.2.2. 1. One can certainly dualize Theorem 3.3.3, Propositions 4.1.1 and 4.1.3, and the results of §3.4 in a similar way also.

In particular, it appears to be no problem to state and prove a vast "mixed motivic" generalization of Theorem 3.6 of [GoG12].

2. Since Chow-weight cohomology yields a mighty tool for computing the dimension of an (effective) motif, it makes all the more sense to make the main "arithmetical" observation of this subsection (that appears to be more interesting either if $R \neq \mathbb{Q}$ or if we study motives over essentially finitely generated fields).

Let $M \in d_{\leq n} DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$ (for some $n \geq 0$). We recall the proof of Theorem 3.2.1(2). There we have checked whether $g : w_{Chow \leq t} l^{c-1}(M) \rightarrow l^{c-1}(M)$ is zero. By our assumption on M , we can assume that $w_{Chow \leq t} l^{c-1}(M)$ is of dimension $\leq d$ (in $DM_{gm}^{R, c-1}$). Hence the corresponding application of Proposition 3.1.2(5) reduces the verification of $g = 0$ to the vanishing of the corresponding $CWH_{*,k(P_j)}^j(M)$ for the dimension of P_j being at most $n - j$.

Thus we obtain the following statement.

Proposition 4.2.3. *Let $M \in \text{Obj } d_{\leq n} DM_{gm,R}^{eff}$ (for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}$). Then the following statements are valid.*

1. *To verify any of the assertions of Theorem 3.2.1 (resp. the condition 4 in the setting of Proposition 3.4.1(2), resp. the condition 2 of Corollary 3.4.2) it suffices to compute the corresponding $CWH_{*,K}^j(M)$ (resp. motivic homology groups over K^{perf}) for K running through function fields of dimension $\leq d - j$ (resp. for K/k of dimension $\leq d$) only.*
2. *In Proposition 3.4.1(2) it suffices to verify condition 3 for rational extensions K/k of transcendence degree $\leq d - j + 1$.*
3. *For $R = \mathbb{Q}$, in the assertion mentioned in part 1 of this proposition it suffices to take K being the algebraic closure of $k(t_1, \dots, t_{d-j})$ (resp. of $k(t_1, \dots, t_d)$) instead.*

Remark 4.2.4. 1. Thus, if M does **not** satisfy the (motivic) equivalence conditions of the statements mentioned in the previous proposition, there necessarily exists a function field K/k of "small dimension" such that (at least) one of the corresponding Chow-weight homology (resp. motivic homology) groups does not vanish over K .

Note also that it is actually suffices to consider dimensions of fields over a field of definition for M (that certainly may be smaller than k).

2. The question whether these dimension restrictions are the best possible ones seems to be quite difficult in general (especially if we consider geometric motives only). Note however that in the case $d = 1$, $R = \mathbb{Q}$, and a finite k it is certainly not sufficient to compute Chow-weight homology over algebraic extensions of k only.

4.3 Comparing integral and rational coefficients: bounding torsion of homology

Let r denote a fixed non-zero integer; we will assume it to be divisible by p if $p > 0$. We deduce some consequences from our result by comparing $\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]$ -motives with $\mathbb{Q}$ -linear motives and with $\mathbb{Z}[1/r]$ -linear ones.

Definition 4.3.1. We will say that $M \in \text{Obj } DM_{gm,\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}^{eff}$ is torsion (resp. r -torsion) if there exists $N_M > 0$ (resp. $d > 0$) such that the morphism $N_M \text{id}_M$ is zero (resp. $r^d \text{id}_M = 0$).

Theorem 3.2.1 easily yields the following statement.

Proposition 4.3.2. *Let $R' = \mathbb{Q}$ (resp. $= \mathbb{Z}[1/r]$). Then the following statements are valid.*

- 1.1. *$DM_{gm,R'}^{eff}$ is isomorphic to the Karoubi envelope of the localization of $DM_{gm,\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}^{eff}$ by its subcategory of torsion (resp., r -torsion) objects. If we will*

write $-\otimes R'$ for the corresponding functor $DM_{gm, \mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}^{eff} \rightarrow DM_{gm, R'}^{eff}$ then for any

$X \in SmVar$ we have $M_{gm}^{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(X) \otimes R' = M_{gm}^{R'}(X)$.

2. $-\otimes R'$ is weight-exact with respect to the Chow weight structures for $DM_{gm, \mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}^{eff}$ and $DM_{gm, R'}^{eff}$ (respectively).

II.1. There exist natural isomorphisms $CWH_{j, K}^{i, R'}(-\otimes R') \cong CWH_{j, K}^i(-) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]} R'$ (for all fields K/k and $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$).

2. Let $M \in \text{Obj } DM_{gm, \mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}^{eff}$, $(n, c) \in \mathbb{Z} \times [0, +\infty)$. Then the groups $CWH_{i, K}^j(M)$ are torsion (resp. r -torsion) for all $i \leq n$, $0 \leq j < c$, and all function fields K/k , if and only if $l_{R'}^{c-1}(M \otimes R') \in DM_{gmw_{Chow} \geq -n+1}^{R', c-1}$.¹²

Proof. I.1. This result was proved in [Kel12]; it can also be easily obtained using the description of $DM_{gm, R}^{eff}$ in terms of $K^b(SmCor_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]})$.

2. Immediate from the previous assertion by Proposition 1.2.4(5).

II.1. Immediate from assertion I.2 (by the definition of Chow-weight homology).

2. Immediate from Theorem 3.2.1(2–3; see also Theorem 3.3.3(3)) applied to $M \otimes R'$ (using the previous assertion). $\square$

Remark 4.3.3. The weight-exactness of $-\otimes R'$ yields that the Chow weight structure for $DM_{gm, R'}^{eff}$ is "determined" by the one for $DM_{gm, \mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}^{eff}$. Thus it may be treated using the localization methods developed in [BoS16a] and [Sos15].

To obtain the corresponding drastic improvement of Proposition 4.3.2(II.2) we need the following technical definition.

Definition 4.3.4. Let I be a staircase set.

We will call it *grounded* if there exists an integer n such that $(n, 0) \notin I$.

We will call it *bounded above* if there exists an $n \geq 0$ such that $(k, n) \notin I$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Theorem 4.3.5. Let $M \in \text{Obj } DM_{gm, \mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}^{eff}$, $I \subset \mathbb{Z} \times [0, +\infty)$.

I. The following conditions are equivalent.

- a. The group $CWH_{i, K}^j(M)$ is torsion for any function field K/k and $(i, j) \in I$.
- b. $CWH_{i, K}^j(M)$ is torsion for any $(i, j) \in I$ and K being some fixed universal domain containing k .

II. Assume in addition that I is a staircase set (in the sense of Definition 3.3.1) and r is a non-zero integer (that we assume to be divisible by p if $p > 0$).

Then the following conditions are equivalent.

A. The groups $CHW_{i, K}^j(M)$ are torsion (resp. r -torsion) for all function fields K/k and $(i, j) \in I$.

B. $N_M \cdot CHW_{i, K}^j(M) = \{0\}$, where N_M is a fixed non-zero integer (resp. a fixed power of r) for all function fields K/k and $(i, j) \in I$.

C. For any $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ there exists a distinguished triangle $T_i \rightarrow M \rightarrow N_i \rightarrow T_i[1]$ satisfying the following conditions: N_i is an extension of an element of

¹²Recall that l^{c-1} for $c \in [0, +\infty]$ denotes the localization functor $DM_{gm, R}^{eff} \rightarrow DM_{gm, R}^{eff}(c)$ for the corresponding R ; so, it is the identity on $DM_{gm, R}^{eff}$ if $c = +\infty$.

$DM_{gm, \mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}^{eff} w_{Chow} \geq -i+1$ by an element of $(DM_{gm, \mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}^{eff} w_{Chow} \leq -i) \langle a_{I,i} \rangle$ and T_i is a torsion motif (resp. is an r -torsion motif).¹³

D. For any integers n, n' there exists a distinguished triangle $T \rightarrow M \rightarrow N \rightarrow T[1]$ satisfying the following conditions: T is a torsion motif (resp. an r -torsion motif), and there exists a triangle $Q \rightarrow N \rightarrow N' \rightarrow Q[1]$ such that $Q \in \underline{C}_{w_{Chow} \geq -n'+1}$ and such that for some weight truncation $w_{Chow} \geq -n N'$ (see Remark 1.2.3(2)) of N' we have $CHW_{i,K}^j(w_{Chow} \geq -n N') = \{0\}$ for all $(i, j) \in I$.

E. For any integers n, n' there exists a distinguished triangle $T \rightarrow M \rightarrow N \rightarrow T[1]$ along with a choice $t(N) = (N^i)$ of a weight complex of N such that N^j is $(j+1)$ -effective whenever $(i, j) \in I \cap [n', n]$ and T is a torsion motif (resp. an r -torsion motif).

E'. For any integers n, n' there exists a distinguished triangle $T \rightarrow M \rightarrow N \rightarrow T[1]$ satisfying the following conditions: T is a torsion motif (resp. an r -torsion motif) and $CHW_{i,K}^j(N) = \{0\}$ if $(i, j) \in I \cap [n', n]$.

III. Assume moreover that I is grounded. Then the conditions in part II are also equivalent to the following one:

F. For any integer n there exists a distinguished triangle $T \rightarrow M \rightarrow N \rightarrow T[1]$ satisfying the following conditions: T is a torsion motif (resp. an r -torsion motif), and for some weight truncation $w_{Chow} \geq -n N$ of N we have $CHW_{i,K}^j(w_{Chow} \geq -n N) = \{0\}$ for all $(i, j) \in I$.

IV. Assume that I is a bounded above staircase set. Then the (equivalent) conditions in part II are equivalent to the following assertion:

G. For any integer n' there exists a distinguished triangle $T \rightarrow M \rightarrow N \rightarrow T[1]$ satisfying the following conditions: T is a torsion motif (resp. an r -torsion motif), and there exists a triangle $Q \rightarrow N \rightarrow N' \rightarrow Q[1]$ such that $Q \in \underline{C}_{w_{Chow} \geq -n'+1}$ and $CHW_{i,K}^j(N') = \{0\}$ for all $(i, j) \in I$.

V. Assume that I is both grounded and bounded above. Then the conditions in part II are equivalent to the following one:

H. There exists a distinguished triangle $T \rightarrow M \rightarrow N \rightarrow T[1]$ satisfying the following conditions: T is a torsion motif (resp. an r -torsion motif) and $CHW_{i,K}^j(N) = \{0\}$ for all $(i, j) \in I$.

Proof. I. Immediate from Proposition 2.3.3(II) applied to $M \otimes \mathbb{Q}$.

II. Certainly, Condition B implies Condition A. Corollary 3.3.4 of [Sos15] yields that D implies E. By the definition of Chow-weight homology, E implies E'.

Next, if T is a torsion (resp. an r -torsion) motif then there exists a non-zero integer (resp. a power of r) n_T such that $n_T \cdot id_T = 0$. Hence all the Chow-weight homology groups of T are killed by (the multiplication by) n_T . Now assume that M belongs to $DM_{gm, \mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}^{eff}[-n+1, -n'-1]$ and E' is fulfilled. Then the long exact sequences for $CHW_{*,K}^j(-)$ coming from the distinguished triangle $T \rightarrow M \rightarrow N \rightarrow T[1]$ (where $CHW_{i,K}^j(N) = \{0\}$ for all $(i, j) \in I \cap [n', n] \times [0, +\infty)$ and T is torsion) yield that $CHW_{i,K}^j(M)$ is killed by the multiplication by n_T whenever $i \leq n$ and $(i, j) \in I$. Moreover, $CHW_{i,K}^j(M) = \{0\}$ if $i \geq n+1$; hence it is also killed by the multiplication by n_T . Thus Condition E' implies B.

¹³Recall that $DM_{gm, \mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}^{eff} \langle +\infty \rangle = \{0\}$ in our convention.

Theorem 3.3.3(3) (applied to the corresponding N) yields that Condition C implies A.

It remains to prove that Condition A implies Conditions C and D. According to Proposition 4.3.2, for any $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have $l_{R'}^{a,i}(M \otimes R') \in DM_{gm, w_{Chow} \leq -i}^{R' a i, j}$ (for $R' = \mathbb{Q}$ or $R' = \mathbb{Z}[1/r]$, respectively). Then applying Proposition 3.3.1 of [Sos15] (see also Remark 3.3.3(2) of *ibid.*) for $\underline{D}_j = DM_{gm, \mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}^{eff} \langle j \rangle$ (where $j \geq 0$) and for K being the subcategory of torsion (resp. r -torsion) objects of $DM_{gm, \mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}^{eff}$ (that corresponds to $S = \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ or to $S = \{r\}$ in the notation of *loc. cit.*, respectively), we obtain that Conditions C and D are fulfilled.

III, IV, V. The equivalence of D to the Conditions F, G, H in the corresponding settings is (also) given by Proposition 3.3.1 and Remark 3.3.3(2) of [Sos15]. □

Now we combine this theorem with the results of §3.4.

Corollary 4.3.6. *Let $M \in \text{Obj } DM_{gm, \mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}^{eff}$.*

I. The "main" versions of the (equivalent) Conditions A–E' of Theorem 4.3.5(II) (i.e., we ignore the versions in brackets that mention r) are also equivalent to any of the following assertions (in the notation of the aforementioned Theorem; so, I is a staircase set).

1. *For all rational extensions K/k and $(i, j) \in I$ the groups $CWH_{i, K}^{j-1, 1}(M)$ are torsion.*
2. *The groups $CWH_{i, K}^{a, j-a}(M)$ are torsion for all $(i, j) \in I$, $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, and all field extensions K/k .*
3. *The groups $CWH_{i, K}^j(M)$ are torsion for K being a fixed universal domain containing k and $(i, j) \in I$.*
4. *There exists an integer $N_M > 0$ such that $N_M CWH_{i, K}^{a, j-a}(M) = \{0\}$ for all $(i, j) \in I$, $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, and all field extensions K/k .*

II. The following conditions are equivalent.

1. $M \otimes \mathbb{Q} \in DM_{-Q}^{eff t_{hom}^Q \leq 0}$.
2. $Chow_{0, l}^{\mathbb{Q}, K}(M) = \{0\}$ for all $l < 0$ and all function fields K/k .
3. *The groups $CWH_{i, K}^{a, j-a}(M)$ are torsion for all $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, $i > j$, and all field extensions K/k .*
4. *There exists an integer $N_M > 0$ such that $N_M CWH_{i, K}^{a, j-a}(M) = \{0\}$ for all $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, $i > j$, and all field extensions K/k .*
5. *For any integer n there exists a distinguished triangle $T \rightarrow M \rightarrow N \rightarrow T[1]$ such that $w_{Chow \geq -n} N \in \text{Obj } DM_{gm, \mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}^{eff} \cap DM_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}^{eff t_{hom}^{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]} \leq 0}$ for some weight truncation $w_{Chow \geq -n} N$ of N and T being a torsion motif.*
6. *There exists $N_M > 0$ such that $N_M Chow_{0, l}^{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}], K}(M) = \{0\}$ for all $l < 0$ and all field extensions K/k .*

7. *There exists a universal domain K containing k such that $\text{Chow}_{0,l}^{\mathbb{Q},K}(M) = \{0\}$ for all $l < 0$.*

Proof. I. Applying Proposition 3.4.1 to $M \otimes \mathbb{Q}$ we obtain that our conditions I.1–3 are equivalent to Condition A of Theorem 4.3.5(II). It remains to note that Condition D of the theorem easily yields our condition I.4 (since the proof of the implication $D \implies B$ in the theorem carries over to higher Chow-weight homology without any difficulty).

II. First we apply Corollary 3.4.2 for $R = \mathbb{Q}$ (and with M replaced by $M \otimes \mathbb{Q}$). We immediately obtain that our conditions II.1, II.2, II.3, and II.7 are equivalent. Certainly, the latter condition is weaker than condition II.6.

Next, condition II.3 implies condition II.4 according to our assertion I (we take $I = \{(i, j) : i > j\}$ in it). Moreover, I is grounded and Theorem 4.3.5(II) yields the following for any M that fulfils one of these six conditions: there exists a distinguished triangle $T \rightarrow M \rightarrow N \rightarrow T[1]$ such that T is a torsion motif and N belongs to the class E mentioned in condition 4 of Corollary 3.4.2 (for $R = \mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]$). Hence $w_{\text{Chow} \geq -n} N \in \text{Obj } DM_{\text{gm}, \mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}^{\text{eff}} \cap DM_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}^{\text{eff}} t_{\text{hom} \leq 0}^{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}$; so we obtain that our condition II.5 is the weakest one among the seven conditions of this assertion.

Thus it remains to verify that the latter condition implies condition II.6. We note that $\text{CWH}_{i,K}^{a,j-a}(N) = \{0\}$ (see Corollary 3.4.2) and that the constant that kills T certainly kills all $\text{CWH}_{*,K}^{*,*}(T)$. Once again, it remains to apply the long exact sequences that relate the Chow-weight homology of M with that of N , $w_{\geq -n} N$ and T for big enough n . □

Remark 4.3.7. It is quite remarkable that we can bound exponents of certain Chow-weight homology groups. Note that (in general) Chow-weight homology groups (as well as motivic homology ones) can certainly have really "weird" torsion.

4.4 On motives with "small" Chow-weight homology and cycle classes

We introduce certain notation for Tate motives.

We will denote by $ECT \subset \text{Obj } \underline{\text{Chow}}_R^{\text{eff}} \subset \text{Obj } DM_{\text{gm}, R}^{\text{eff}}$ the set $\{R\langle j \rangle : j \geq 0\}$. We denote by $EPT \subset \text{Obj } DM_{\text{gm}, R}^{\text{eff}}$ the bigger set $\{R\langle j \rangle[i] : j \geq 0, i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$.

Throughout this subsection we will assume that $R = \mathbb{Q}$.

Proposition 4.4.1. *Assume that k is a universal domain, I is a staircase set.*

Then for $M \in \text{Obj } DM_{\text{gm}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\text{eff}}$ the groups $\text{CWH}_{i,k}^j(M)$ are finite-dimensional $\mathbb{Q}$ -vector spaces for all $(i, j) \in I$ if and only if M belongs to the extension-closure of $\cup_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} (\text{Obj } \text{Chow}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\text{eff}}[-i]\langle a_{I,i} \rangle) \cup EPT$.

Proof. Recall that for any $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and any element of $\text{Obj } \text{Chow}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\text{eff}}[-i]\langle a_{I,i} \rangle$ we have $\text{CWH}_{i,k}^j(M) = \{0\}$ for any $(i, j) \in I$ (see Theorem 3.3.3(3)), whereas the only non-zero Chow-weight homology of the Tate motif $T = \mathbb{Q}\langle j \rangle[-i]$ is $\text{CWH}_{i,k}^j(T) \cong \mathbb{Q}$. Since Chow-weight homology functors are homological, we obtain that any element of the extension-closure in question does have finite-dimensional $\text{CWH}_{i,k}^j$ -homology for $(i, j) \in I$.

Now we verify the converse implication. Certainly, the number of non-zero Chow-weight homology groups of M is finite, and a non-zero element of $\mathrm{CWH}_{i,k}^j(M)$ yields a morphism $\mathbb{Q}\langle j\rangle[-i] \rightarrow t(M)$.¹⁴ Thus there exists a $K^b(\mathrm{Chow}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\mathrm{eff}})$ -morphism $\bigoplus_i \mathbb{Q}\langle j_i\rangle[-i_i] \rightarrow t(M)$ (for some $i_i \in \mathbb{Z}$, $j_i \geq 0$) such that for its cone C we have $\mathrm{CWH}_{i,k}^j(C) = \{0\}$ for all $(i, j) \in I$. Applying the $K^b(\mathrm{Chow}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\mathrm{eff}})$ -version of Theorem 3.3.3(3) (see Remark 3.3.4) we obtain that C belongs to the $K^b(\mathrm{Chow}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\mathrm{eff}})$ -extension-closure of the set $\cup_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} (\mathrm{Obj} \mathrm{Chow}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\mathrm{eff}}[-i]\langle a_{I,i}\rangle)$. It remains to apply Proposition 1.4.2(4) to conclude the proof. $\square$

This statement easily yields a generalization of Theorem 3.18 of [Voi14].

Remark 4.4.2. 1. We conjecture that for any k and a universal domain K containing it the $\mathbb{Q}$ -finite-dimensionality of $\mathrm{CWH}_{i,K}^j(M)$ for $(i, j) \in I$ is equivalent to M belonging to the extension-closure of the union of $\cup_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} (\mathrm{Obj} \mathrm{Chow}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\mathrm{eff}}[-i]\langle a_{I,i}\rangle)$ with the set of *Artin-Tate* motives.

The following observation may be helpful here: the compositions of Chow-weight homology functors with the localization of $\mathbb{Q} - \mathrm{Vect}$ by the Serre subcategory of finite dimensional spaces yield well-defined functors on the localization of $DM_{gm,\mathbb{Q}}^{\mathrm{eff}}$ by the triangulated subcategory generated by (effective) Artin-Tate motives.

On the other hand, we doubt that any "reasonable" analogue of this statement holds in the case where R is not a $\mathbb{Q}$ -algebra.

2. One can define another notion of "smallness" of Chow-weight homology using ("Chow-weight") cycle classes.

So, let $F^j : \mathrm{Chow}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\mathrm{eff}} \rightarrow \mathrm{Ab}$ be an additive functor, and let Φ^j be a natural transformation $\mathrm{Chow}_j^{R,K} \rightarrow F^j$ (say, for K being a universal domain). Then Φ^j obviously extends to a natural transformation $\tilde{\Phi}^j$ of functors $\mathrm{CWH}_{i,K}^j \implies \tilde{F}^j$ of the functors $DM_{gm,\mathbb{Q}}^{\mathrm{eff}} \rightarrow \mathrm{Ab}$ defined using Proposition 1.4.2(6). Now, for a collection of Φ^j of this sort (for $j \geq 0$) one may study the conditions ensuring that the homomorphisms $\tilde{\Phi}_i^j(M)$ are injective for all $(i, j) \in I$ (in particular, in the case $I = \mathbb{Z} \times [0, +\infty)$).

Certainly, the transformations Φ^j are usually "mutually coherent" in the cases of interest. Below we will consider Φ^j being cycle classes into étale and singular homology. It would be also interesting to treat cycle classes into the Deligne-Beilinson homology here (for $K = \mathbb{C}$). The corresponding "pure criterion" (for effective Chow motives) can be immediately deduced from [EsL93, Theorem 1.2].

Possibly, questions of this sort will be treated in our future papers (in particular, for $R \neq \mathbb{Q}$). For this purpose it may be useful to consider homology defined using functors from $\underline{\mathrm{Chow}}_R^{\mathrm{eff}}$ into some category of sheaves; cf. Remark 4.5.1(2) below.

Proposition 4.4.3. *Let l be a prime distinct from $p = \mathrm{char} k$ and consider Φ^j being the natural transformations from $\mathrm{Chow}_j^{\mathbb{Q},k}$ into the étale homology functors $F^j = N \mapsto D(\mathbb{Q}_l - \mathrm{Vect})(\mathbb{Q}_l(-i)[-2i], \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{Q}_l}^{\mathrm{et}}(N))$, where $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{Q}_l}^{\mathrm{et}}$ is the (covariant) étale realization of M with values in $DSh^{\mathrm{et}}(\mathrm{Spec} k, \mathbb{Q}_l) \cong D(\mathbb{Q}_l - \mathrm{Vect})$ (see*

¹⁴This is why we want k to be a universal domain itself.

Remark 7.2.25 of [CiD16]; note that $(-i)$ here is non-canonically isomorphic to the identical endofunctor). We adopt the assumptions of Proposition 4.4.1, and call the equivalent conditions of Proposition 4.4.1 Condition C.

Then this condition is also equivalent to either of the following ones.

A. The homomorphism $\tilde{\Phi}_i^j(M)$ is injective whenever $(i, j) \in I$.

B. The kernel of $\tilde{\Phi}_i^j(M)$ is a finite-dimensional $\mathbb{Q}$ -vector space for any $(i, j) \in I$.

Moreover, if k is a subfield of $\mathbb{C}$ then these conditions are equivalent to the injectivity of $\tilde{\Phi}_i^j(M)$ in the same range for F^j being the $\mathbb{Q}$ -linear singular homology functors.

Proof. Certainly, Condition A implies Condition B.

Next, to prove that Condition B implies Condition C the following is easily (according to Proposition 1.4.2(4)) seen to be sufficient to prove: if Condition B is fulfilled for M and for a fixed $(i, j) \in I$ there exists a choice of $t(M)$ such that M^p belongs to $ECT \oplus \text{Obj } \text{Chow}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{eff}\langle j+1 \rangle$ for $p > i$ and belongs to $EC \oplus \text{Obj } \text{Chow}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{eff}\langle j \rangle$ for $p = i$ then $t(M)$ is homotopy equivalent to a complex with the same M^p for $p > i$ and with M^i belonging to $ECT \oplus \text{Obj } \text{Chow}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{eff}\langle j+1 \rangle$. Certainly, it suffices to verify the latter implication for $I = [i, +\infty) \times [0, j]$.

Now, the corresponding stupid truncation $TM_{\leq -i-1} = w_{\text{stupid}, \leq -i-1}t(M)$ (i.e., the complex $\cdots \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow M^{i+1} \rightarrow M^{i+2} \rightarrow \cdots$; see Remark 1.2.3(1)) belongs to $\langle \text{Obj } DM_{gm, \mathbb{Q}}^{eff}\langle j+1 \rangle \cup ECT \rangle_{K^b(\text{Chow}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{eff})}$. Then for $TM_{\geq -i}$ being the corresponding choice of $w_{\text{stupid}, \geq -i}t(M)$ the obvious $K^b(\text{Chow}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{eff})$ -version of Condition B is also fulfilled (since we assume $I = [i, +\infty) \times [0, j]$) and $N^i = M^i$.¹⁵ Now, the image of the corresponding $\tilde{\Phi}_i^j(TM_{\geq -i})$ is a quotient of the finite-dimensional $\mathbb{Q}$ -vector space $\text{Im}(\text{Chow}_{\mathbb{Q}}^j(M^i) \rightarrow F^j(M^i))$ (note that $\text{Chow}_{\mathbb{Q}}^j(M^i) \cong \text{Chow}_{\mathbb{Q}}^j(M^i\langle -j \rangle)$ and $F^j(M^i) \cong F^0(M^i\langle -j \rangle)$). Thus $\tilde{\Phi}_i^j(TM_{\geq -i})$ is finite-dimensional. Applying the $K^b(\text{Chow}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{eff})$ -version of Proposition 4.4.1 to $TM_{\geq -i}$ we obtain that this complex is homotopy equivalent to a complex whose i th term belongs to $ECT \oplus \text{Obj } \text{Chow}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{eff}\langle j+1 \rangle$. Certainly this implies the statement in question.

Now we prove $C \implies A$. We fix some $(i, j) \in I$ and choose $t(M)$ so that $M^i = T \oplus T'\langle j+1 \rangle \in ECT \oplus \text{Obj } \text{Chow}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{eff}\langle j+1 \rangle$. Then $\Phi^j(M^i)$ is easily seen to be injective. To prove that $\tilde{\Phi}_i^j(M)$ is injective also it suffices to note that Chow-morphisms $M^{i-1} \rightarrow T$ correspond to algebraic cycles (on a variety corresponding to M^{i-1}), and homologically non-trivial cycles are not rationally trivial.

Lastly, Condition A is certainly equivalent to its $\mathbb{Q}_l$ -linear singular homology analogue. Certainly, the latter injectivity condition is also equivalent to its q -linear version in question. $\square$

4.5 Some more remarks; possible development

We make some more remarks on our main results; some of them concern studying torsion phenomena. Possibly the matters mentioned below will be studied in

¹⁵Actually, one easily work with w_{Chow} -truncations in $DM_{gm, \mathbb{Q}}^{eff}$ instead of w_{stupid} -ones throughout this argument.

consequent papers.

Remark 4.5.1. 1. The main formulations of this paper are easier to apply when $R = \mathbb{Q}$ (or R is a $\mathbb{Q}$ -algebra). Now we describe some ideas related to motives and cohomology with integral and torsion coefficients.

Firstly we note that a bound on the dimension of a motif certainly yields some information on its (co)homology. In particular, the $\mathbb{Z}_l$ -étale homology H of an object M of $\underline{Chow}_R^{eff}$ of dimension at most d is concentrated in degrees $[-2d, 0]$ (here we take a prime $l \neq p$, a coefficient ring not containing $1/l$, and consider the étale homology over an algebraically closed field of definition; we apply our convention for enumerating homology). Moreover, considering the relation between $\mathbb{Z}_l$ -homology and $\mathbb{Z}/l\mathbb{Z}$ -one one obtains that $H_{-2d}(M)$ is torsion-free.

One can use these simple remarks for studying the E_2 -terms of Chow-weight spectral sequences for H ; cf. Proposition 4.1.1. In particular, the latter of them can be applied for studying "comparing M with $M \otimes \mathbb{Q}$ "; cf. [Voi14, Remark 3.11]. Note however that the groups $E_2^{**}T(H, M)$ cannot be recovered from the weight filtration on $H_*(M)$ in general; see [GiS96, §3.1.3].

These observations certainly demonstrate the actuality of bounding dimensions of motives (for our purposes). We will say more on bounds of this sort in part 3 of this remark.

2. In the current paper we treat Chow-weight homology (of a fixed $M \in \text{Obj } DM_{\text{gm}, R}^{eff}$) as functors that associate to field extensions of k certain R -modules. Yet one can apply a "more structured" approach instead; it seems to be especially actual for $R \neq \mathbb{Q}$.

For any $U \in \text{SmVar}$ and $t_R(M) = (M^*)$, $j, l \in \mathbb{Z}$, one can consider the homology of the complex $DM_{\text{gm}}^R(M_{\text{gm}}^R(U)(j)[2j+l], M^*)$. Next the functors obtained can be sheafified with respect to U ; this yields a collection of certain *Chow-weight homology sheaves* (for any (j, l)). Moreover, if $j \geq 0$ then the sheafifications of $U \mapsto (M_{\text{gm}}^R(U)(j)[2j], M^i)$ (that were called the *Chow sheaves* of M^i in [KaL10]) are birational (in U , i.e., they convert open dense embeddings of smooth varieties into isomorphisms; see Remark 2.3 of [HuK06]). Hence the corresponding Chow-weight homology sheaves are birational also. Possibly this sheaf-theoretic approach will be applied in a subsequent paper.

Moreover, these observations can probably be extended to the setting of motives (with rational coefficients) over any "reasonable" base scheme S ; one should study the corresponding *dimensional homotopy invariant* Chow sheaves for S -motives (recall that those are conjecturally Rost's cycle modules over S) and apply the results of [BoD15].

3. Theorem 3.3.3(5) demonstrates that it is possible to combine the effectivity restrictions on (terms of weight complexes of) motives with dimension bounds. However, one may study a bound on the dimensions of M^i that depends on i (cf. Remark 4.2.2(1)). It appears to be possible combine bounds of this sort with effectivity ones; for this purpose one may combine the localization method applied in [Bon16a] with the results of [Bon15b]

(that allow treating terms of weight complexes "separately") and with [Sos15, Proposition 3.3.1].

4. $\underline{Chow}_R^{eff}$ -complexes of length 1 yield a simple counterexample to the natural analogue of Theorem 3.2.1(3) for motives whose Chow-weight homology vanishes in degrees **less** than n (and so, also to the corresponding analogues of Theorem 3.2.1(2) and Theorem 3.3.3(3)). Let $R = \mathbb{Q}$, $k \subset K = \mathbb{C}$ (actually, any K that is not an algebraic extension of a finite field is fine for our purposes); take a smooth projective P/k (say, an elliptic curve) that possesses a 0-cycle c_0 of degree 0 that is rationally non-torsion. We also use the notation c_0 for the corresponding morphism $\mathbb{Q} = M_{gm}^{\mathbb{Q}}(pt) \rightarrow M_{gm}^{\mathbb{Q}}(P)$; let C be the cone of c_0 (i.e., $C = \dots 0 \rightarrow \mathbb{Q} \xrightarrow{c_0} M_{gm}^{\mathbb{Q}}(P) \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \dots$; $M_{gm}^{\mathbb{Q}}(P)$ is in degree 0).

Since c_0 is rationally non-trivial (as a cycle with $\mathbb{Q}$ -coefficients), $Chow_0^{\mathbb{Q}}(c_0)$ is an injection (and so, $Chow_j^{\mathbb{Q},K}(c_0)$ is injective for any $j \geq 0$ and K/k). Hence $CWH_{i,K}^j(C) = 0$ whenever $i \neq 0$ (and any field extension K/k). On the other hand, c_0 does not split since it is numerically trivial as a cycle. Hence C does not belong to $K^b(Chow_{\mathbb{Q}}^{eff})_{w_{Chow} \leq 0}$ (or to $DM_{gm,\mathbb{Q}}^{eff}_{w_{Chow} \leq 0}$ if we "put it into" $DM_{gm,\mathbb{Q}}^{eff}$). So, the vanishing of the Chow-weight homology in negative degrees does not imply that the weights of a motif M are non-negative.

Moreover, one can consider the tensor product of two examples of this type. If the corresponding P_i ($i = 1, 2$) are (smooth projective) curves of positive genus then one can easily check that $CWH_{i,K}^j(C_1 \otimes C_2) = 0$ whenever $i \neq 0$ (for any $j \geq 0$ and any field extension K/k). On the other hand, $C = C_1 \otimes C_2$ does not even belong to $K^b(Chow_{\mathbb{Q}}^{eff})_{w_{Chow} \leq 1}$ (easy; look at the naturally defined Deligne's weights of the étale cohomology of C) if we consider C as an object of $K^b(Chow_{\mathbb{Q}}^{eff})$. Considering C as an object of $DM_{gm,\mathbb{Q}}^{eff}$ yields the corresponding example in the latter category.

Furthermore, triple tensor products of C_i of this type possibly yield similar examples with $C \notin DM_{gm,\mathbb{Q}}^{eff}_{w_{Chow} \leq 2}$.

So, Chow-weight homology cannot be used for bounding weights from above. On the other hand, the argument used in the proof of Proposition 4.1.3 can easily be modified to prove that the weight filtration on singular homology does yield bounds of this sort (if one assumes conjectures A and B in the proposition); the corresponding version of Proposition 4.1.1 is valid also.

5. Our arguments are rather formal and mostly rely on the existence of compatible Chow weight structures for the motivic categories we consider. So our results can probably be extended to certain categories of *effective geometric cobordism* motives (i.e., to the corresponding subcategory of the triangulated category of MGL -module spectra) at least if $p = 0$; cf. §6.3 of [Bon13] and Example 1.3.1(3) of [BoD15].

References

- [Bach15] Bachmann T., On the invertibility of motives of affine quadrics, preprint, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1506.07377>
- [BaS01] Balmer P., Schlichting M., Idempotent completion of triangulated categories// Journal of Algebra 236, no. 2 (2001), 819–834.
- [Bei87] Beilinson A., Height pairing between algebraic cycles, in: K-theory, Arithmetic and Geometry, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1289, Springer, 1987, 1–26.
- [BLE08] Blickle M., Esnault H., Rational singularities and rational points// Pure and Applied Mathematics Quarterly, 4(3), 729–741.
- [Blo10] Bloch S., Lectures on algebraic cycles, vol. 16. Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- [BIS83] Bloch S., Srinivas V., Remarks on correspondences and algebraic cycles// American Journal of Mathematics, 1983, 1235–1253.
- [Bon09] Bondarko M.V., Differential graded motives: weight complex, weight filtrations and spectral sequences for realizations; Voevodsky vs. Hana-mura// J. of the Inst. of Math. of Jussieu, v.8 (2009), no. 1, 39–97, see also <http://arxiv.org/abs/math.AG/0601713>
- [Bon10a] Bondarko M.V., Weight structures vs. t -structures; weight filtrations, spectral sequences, and complexes (for motives and in general)// J. of K-theory, v. 6, i. 03, pp. 387–504, 2010, see also <http://arxiv.org/abs/0704.4003>
- [Bon10b] Bondarko M.V., Motivically functorial coniveau spectral sequences; direct summands of cohomology of function fields// Doc. Math., extra volume: Andrei Suslin’s Sixtieth Birthday (2010), 33–117; see also <http://arxiv.org/abs/0812.2672>
- [Bon11] Bondarko M.V., $\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]$ -motivic resolution of singularities// Compositio Math., vol. 147, iss. 5, 2011, 1434–1446.
- [Bon13] Bondarko M.V., Gersten weight structures for motivic homotopy categories; direct summands of cohomology of function fields and coniveau spectral sequences, preprint, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1312.7493>
- [Bon15a] Bondarko M.V., Mixed motivic sheaves (and weights for them) exist if ‘ordinary’ mixed motives do, Compositio Mathematica, vol. 151, 2015, 917–956.
- [Bon15b] Bondarko M.V., On morphisms killing weights, weight complexes, and Eilenberg-MacLane (co)homology of spectra, preprint, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1509.08453>
- [Bon16a] Bondarko M.V., Intersecting the dimension filtration with the slice one for (relative) motivic categories, preprint, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1603.09330>

- [Bon16b] Bondarko M.V., On infinite effectivity of motivic spectra and the vanishing of their motives, preprint, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1602.04477>
- [BoS16a] Bondarko M.V., Sosnilo V.A., Non-commutative localizations of additive categories and weight structures; applications to birational motives// J. of the Inst. of Math. of Jussieu, Published online: 24 May 2016, 1–37, DOI: 10.1017/S1474748016000207.
- [BoS16b] Bondarko M.V., Sosnilo V.A., On constructing weight structures and extending them onto idempotent extensions, preprint, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1605.08372>
- [BoD15] Bondarko M.V., Deglise F., Dimensional homotopy t -structures in motivic homotopy theory, preprint, 2015, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1512.06044>
- [BoL16] Bondarko M.V., Luzgarev A. Ju, On relative K -motives, weights for them, and negative K -groups, preprint, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1605.08435>
- [CiD12] Cisinski D.-C., Déglise F., Triangulated categories of mixed motives, preprint, <http://arxiv.org/abs/0912.2110v3>
- [CiD15] Cisinski D.-C., Déglise F., Integral mixed motives in equal characteristic, Documenta Mathematica, Extra Volume: Alexander S. Merkurjev's Sixtieth Birthday, 145–194, 2015.
- [CiD16] Cisinski D., Déglise F., Étale motives// Comp. Math., vol. 152, n. 3, 2016, 556–666.
- [Deg08] Deglise F., Around the Gysin triangle II// Documenta Mathematica, v. 13, 2008, 613–675.
- [Deg11] Déglise F., Modules homotopiques (Homotopy modules)// Doc. Math. 16 (2011), 411–455.
- [Esn03] Esnault H. (2003). Varieties over a finite field with trivial Chow group of 0-cycles have a rational point// Inv. math., 151(1), 187–191.
- [EsL93] Esnault H., Levine M., Surjectivity of cycle maps// Astérisque 218 (1993), 203–226.
- [GiS96] Gillet H., Soulé C. Descent, motives and K -theory// J. f. die reine und ang. Math. v. 478, 1996, 127–176.
- [GoG12] Gorchinskiy S., Guletskij V., Transcendence degree of zero-cycles and the structure of Chow motives// Cent. Eur. J. Math., 10(2), 2012, 559–568.
- [GoG13] Gorchinskiy S., Guletskij V., Non-trivial elements in the Abel-Jacobi kernels of higher-dimensional varieties// Advances in Mathematics, 241 (2013), 162–191.
- [Han99] Hanamura M. Mixed motives and algebraic cycles, III// Math. Res. Letters 6, 1999, 61–82.
- [HuK06] Huber A., Kahn B. The slice filtration and mixed Tate motives// Compos. Math. 142(4), 2006, 907–936.

- [Kah05] Kahn B., Algebraic K-theory, algebraic cycles and arithmetic geometry, in: Handbook of K-theory, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2005. 351–428.
- [KaL10] Kahn B., Levine M., Motives of Azumaya algebras// J. of the Inst. of Math. of Jussieu, vol. 9 (2010), 481–599.
- [KaS15] Kahn B., Sujatha R., Birational motives, II: triangulated birational motives, preprint, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1506.08385>
- [Kel12] Kelly S., Triangulated categories of motives in positive characteristic, PhD thesis of Université Paris 13 and of the Australian National University, 2012, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1305.5349>
- [KeS14] Kelly S., Saito S., Weight homology of motives, preprint, <http://www.lcv.ne.jp/~smaki/articles/mhf-final.pdf>
- [MVW06] Mazza C., Voevodsky V., Weibel Ch., Lecture notes on motivic cohomology, Clay Mathematics Monographs, vol. 2, 2006.
- [Pau08] Pauksztello D., Compact cochain objects in triangulated categories and co-t-structures// Central European Journal of Mathematics, vol. 6, n. 1, 2008, 25–42.
- [Par94] Paranjape K.H., Cohomological and cycle-theoretic connectivity// Annals of Mathematics (1994), 641–660.
- [Sos15] Sosnilo V.A., Weight structures in localizations (revisited) and the weight lifting property, preprint, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1510.03403>
- [Via11] Vial C., Remarks on motives of abelian type, preprint, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1112.1080>
- [Voe00a] Voevodsky V. Triangulated category of motives, in: Voevodsky V., Suslin A., and Friedlander E., Cycles, transfers and motivic homology theories, Annals of Mathematical studies, vol. 143, Princeton University Press, 2000, 188–238.
- [Voe00b] Voevodsky V. Cohomological theory of presheaves with transfers, same volume, 87–137.
- [Voi14] Voisin C., Chow Rings, Decomposition of the diagonal, and the topology of families (AM-187). Princeton University Press, 2014.
- [Wil09] Wildeshaus J., Chow motives without projectivity// Compositio Mathematica, v. 145(5), 2009, 1196–1226.